This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

3 3433 06731567 5

From the bequest of
EDWARD S. HARKNESS
Benefactor and Trustee of
The New York Public Library
Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations

V.11
NKE
Volte

H. Rigaud pinx.t J. Hall sculp.

THE

WORKS

4373 OF

M. DE VOLTAIRE.

Tranſlated from the FRENCH.

WITH

Notes, Hiſtorical and Critical.

By T. SMOLLETT, M. D.

T. FRANCKLIN, M. A. and OTHERS.

VOLUME THE NINTH.

LONDON,

Printed for J. NEWBERY, R. BALDWIN, W. JOHNSTON, S. CROWDER, T. DAVIES, J. COOTE, G. KEARSLEY, and B. COLLINS, at Salisbury.

MDCCLXI.

v1

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
5903138
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
B 1951 L

THE

CONTE

OF THE

NINTH VOL

CHAP. CCIV.

Of the Polite Arts.

CHAP. CCV.

Sequel of the Arts.

CHAP. CCVI.

Ecclesiastical Affairs: Memorable Disputes

CHAP. CCVII.

Of Calvinism.

CHAP. CCVIII

Of Jansenism.

CHAP. CCIX.

Of Quietism.

CHAP. CCX.

Disputes upon the Ceremonies of the Chinese.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. CCXI.

A Recapitulation of the whole of the Foregoing Hiſtory, with the Point of Light in which it ought to be conſidered. 142

CHAP CCXII.

Of the Polite Arts in Europe, at the Time of Lewis XIV. 152

CHAP. CCXIII.

A Liſt of the Children of Lewis XIV. The Sovereign Princes contemporary with him. His Generals and Miniſters. 163

CHAP. CCXIV.

A Catalogue of moſt of the French Writers who flouriſhed in the Age of Lewis XIV. to ſerve towards the literary hiſtory of that Age. 181

CHAP. CCXV.

Of Celebrated Artiſts. 306

MODERN HISTORY

CONTINUED.

CHAP. CCIII.

Of the POLITE ARTS.

TRUE philoſophy made not ſo conſiderable a progreſs in France as in England and Florence; and though the academy of ſciences was particularly ſerviceable to human nature, it did not ſet the character of France above that of other nations; all the nobleſt inventions and great truths had their riſe elſewhere.

But in eloquence, poetry, and polite learning, in books of morality and entertainment, the French muſt be conſidered as the legiſlators of Europe. There was no longer any taſte in Italy. True eloquence was every where unknown; religion was ridiculouſly delivered from the pulpit; and the pleadings at the bar were as bad. Virgil and Ovid were quoted by

the preachers; St. Jerom and St. Auguſtine by the lawyers. No man had yet appeared of genius ſufficient to poliſh the French tongue, to enrich it with harmony, propriety of expreſſion and dignity. That it was capable of grandeur and force, was indeed evident from ſome verſes of Malherbe; but this was all. Preſident de Thou, chancellor de l'Hopital, and other celebrated writers, who had expreſſed themſelves to ſuch advantage in the Latin language, made but a poor figure in their native tongue; it was too much for them to manage. The French was as yet only valuable for a certain air of ſimplicity, in which ſolely conſiſted the merits of Joinville, Amiot, Marot, Montagne, Reginer, and the ſatire Menippee; nor was this ſimplicity unincumbered by irregularity and ruſticity. John de Lingendes, biſhop of Macon, at preſent unknown, becauſe his works were never printed, was the firſt orator who declaimed with ſublimity. His ſermons and funeral orations, though ſomething obſcured by the ruſt of the time in which he lived, were models for thoſe by whom he was imitated and ſurpaſſed. In 1630, he pronounced the funeral oration of Charles Emanuel, duke of Savoy, ſirnamed, in his own country, the Great. It abounded with ſuch fine ſtrokes of eloquence, that Flechier long after took from thence the exordium, text, and many conſiderable paſſages, to adorn his famous funeral oration upon the viſcount de Turenne.

It was about this time that Balſac gave meaſure and harmony to proſe. His letters are, it is true, often bombaſtic. He writes to the firſt cardinal de Retz, "You are come from taking

the ſceptre of kings and the livery of roſes." Speaking of perfumed waters, in a letter from Rome to Bois Robert, "I have eſcaped by ſwimming in my chamber through the midſt of perfumes." With all theſe faults he charms the ear: ſuch power has eloquence over the mind of man, that Balzac was now admired for having found out that ſmall portion of this art, ſo neceſſary, yet ſo little known, which directs an harmonious choice of words; and he was even praiſed for having often miſplaced them.

Voiture gave ſome idea of the light graces of that epiſtolary ſtile, which is by no means the beſt, becauſe it conſiſts only of pleaſantry. It is owing to a trifling imagination, that in his two volumes of letters not one of them is inſtructive, or ſeems to come from the heart. None of them depict the manners of the times, the characters of men. They are rather an abuſe than exerciſe of genius.

The language was refined by degrees, and obtained ſomething of a fixed form. We are for this obliged to the academy of ſciences, and particularly to Vaugelas. The firſt well written book was his tranſlation of Quintus Curtius, which was publiſhed in 1646; and wherein, even now, there are but few obſolete phraſes and expreſſions. Oliver Patru, who follows next, contributed much to regulate and refine the language; and though he was not deemed a profound lawyer, we owe to him order, perſpicuity, and elegance of harangue, merits abſolutely unknown at the bar. The little collection of maxims written by Francis duke of Rochefoucault, was one of the works that contributed to form the taſte of the nation, to com-

municate a ſpirit of preciſion and propriety: though in this book there is ſcarcely more than this one truth: "Self love is the primum mobile of all our actions." Yet this one thought appears in ſuch various lights, that it is always ſtriking. It is rather a collection of materials to adorn a book than a book itſelf. It was read with eagerneſs; it accuſtomed us to think, and to compriſe our thoughts in a ſpirited, determinate, delicate turn of phraſe. No other writer in Europe could boaſt this merit ſince the revival of letters. But the firſt book of genius that appeared in proſe was the collection of Provincial Letters in 1654. Herein may be found every ſpecies of eloquence: though an hundred years are paſt ſince that publication, not a ſingle word occurs in it ſavouring of that change and alteration to which living languages are ſo very liable. With this work then we may fix the epocha when our language obtained a ſettled form. The biſhop of Luçon, ſon to the celebrated Buſſi, told me, that having aſked Boſſuet, biſhop of Meaux, what work he would have choſen to be the author of, ſetting his own performances out of the queſtion, he anſwered, the Provincial Letters.

The fine taſte which runs through the whole of this book, and the ſtrength of the laſt letters, were not yet of force ſufficient to correct that diſpirited, diffuſe, incorrect, harſh ſtile, which had been ſo long in uſe with our writers, preachers, and lawyers.

A new light aroſe in 1668. This was father Bourdaloue; he was the firſt who maintained in the pulpit a noble uniformity of eloquence. Other orators have ſince appeared in the pulpit,

as

as Maſſillon, biſhop of Clermont, in whoſe ſermons are found more graces, more delicate and maſterly pictures of the manners of the age; but none of them can eclipſe Bourdalone: In his ſtile, more nervous than florid, without appealing to fancy for expreſſion, he ſeems rather to aim at convincing than inflaming; and he never labours to pleaſe. Perhaps it were to be wiſhed, that in baniſhing from the pulpit that falſe taſte whereby it had been ſo long debaſed, he had alſo ſuppreſſed the cuſtom of preaching upon one text. In reality, to ſpeak for a good while upon a quotation of one or two lines, to weary one's ſelf in accommodating the whole diſcourſe to that ſingle line, ſeems to be a play on words little ſuiting the gravity of a divine. The text is a kind of device or enigma, to be explained by the ſermon. This cuſtom was unknown to the Greeks and Romans; it aroſe upon the decline of letters, and has been made ſacred by time.

The method of always dividing into two or three points things that in themſelves require no diviſion, as morality; or that require to be more minutely divided, as controverſy, is an arbitrary cuſtom which this great preacher found eſtabliſhed, and with which he choſe to conform.

Boſſuet, afterwards biſhop of Meaux, had preceded him. He, who proved afterwards ſo great a man, was at firſt intended for the bar, and contracted when very young to mademoiſelle Deſvieux, a lady of extraordinary merit. But his talents for divinity, and for that kind of eloquence, whereby he is particularly diſtinguiſhed, appeared ſo very early, that his relations and

friends reſolved to bequeath him rather to the church. Mademoiſelle Deſvieux intereſted herſelf in determining him in this point, preferring his glory to the happineſs of ſpending with him her life. In 1662, he being yet very young, he preached before the king and the queen-mother; this was long before father Bourdaloue was known. His diſcourſes, animated by a noble and affecting manner, were the firſt which had been delivered at court with any marks of ſublimity; and they were ſo well received, that the king cauſed a letter to be written in his own name to Boſſuet's father, the intendant of Soiſſons, congratulating him on the merit of his ſon.

Nevertheleſs, monſieur Boſſuet was no longer eſteemed the firſt preacher when father Bourdaloue appeared. The former had applied himſelf to the compoſing funeral orations; a ſpecies of eloquence that admits of being adorned by imagination, and requires a majeſtic grandeur bordering upon poetry, from which it muſt borrow ſomewhat, though reſtricted when it aims at the ſublime. In 1667, he pronounced the funeral oration of the queen-mother, and it procured him the biſhopric of Condom: it was a performance unworthy of him, and was never printed; nor were his ſermons. The funeral elogium upon the queen of England, widow of Charles I. which he delivered in 1669, is allowed to be a maſter-piece. The ſubjects in theſe pieces of eloquence are happy in proportion to the misfortunes ſuſtained by the perſonages whom they celebrate. It is in theſe pieces of writing as in tragedy, where we are intereſted for the principal characters, in proportion as their

their misfortunes encreaſe. His funeral oration upon the dutcheſs of Orleans, who was ſnatched away in the flower of her youth, and may be ſaid to have expired in his arms, had the great and uncommon effect of melting the whole court into tears: he was obliged to ſtop at theſe words: "Oh! diſaſtrous night! night teeming with horror and confuſion, in which the aſtoniſhing news of madame is dying; ſhe is already dead, burſt upon us like a clap of thunder." His auditors were filled with grief; and the voice of the orator was for ſome time loſt in their tears and their ſighs.

The French only ſucceeded in this kind of eloquence. A new one was ſoon after invented by the ſame man, which in any other hand could ſcarcely have ſucceeded. He applied the charms of oratory to hiſtory itſelf; the ſimplicity of which ſeems to exclude ſuch aſſiſtance. His diſcourſe upon univerſal hiſtory, written for the uſe of the dauphin, is without model or imitation. If he has been oppoſed by the learned in the ſyſtem which he adopts for reconciling the Jewiſh chronology to that of other nations, nevertheleſs his ſtile has been univerſally admired. The world was aſtoniſhed at that majeſtic force with which he deſcribes manners and government, the riſe and fall of vaſt empires, and thoſe rapid ſtrokes of energetic truth with which he paints the manners, and judges the nations.

Almoſt all the works which reflect ſo much honour upon this age were of a ſpecies unknown to antiquity. Among them is Telemachus. This extraordinary book, in which at once unite the powers of romance and poetry, the ſtile of which is a meaſured proſe bordering upon ver-

ſification, was compoſed by Fenelon, the diſciple and friend of Boſſuet; though afterwards, much againſt his will, he became his rival and his enemy. One would think Fenelon had a mind to treat romance as the biſhop of Meaux had done hiſtory, by enduing it with dignity and charms before unknown; but more eſpecially by drawing from theſe fictions a moral that might be uſeful to mankind; a moral till then entirely neglected in every fabulous invention. It has been generally believed he compoſed this work to ſerve as themes of inſtruction to the duke of Burgundy, and the two other children of France, he being their preceptor, as Boſſuet had formed his univerſal hiſtory to help the education of the dauphin: but I was aſſured of the contrary by the marquis de Fenelon, the nephew of this great man, who inherited all his virtues, and was killed at the battle of Rocou. Nor does it indeed ſeem probable that the firſt leſſons furniſhed by a prieſt to the children of France ſhould be the loves of Calypſo and Eucharis.

It was after he received orders to retire to his dioceſe of Cambray that he compoſed this performance. Well read in the ancients, and bleſt with a ſtrong and glowing imagination, he formed a ſtile peculiar to himſelf, and he wrote it with infinite eaſe. I have ſeen the original manuſcript; there are not ten blots in the whole. It is pretended that the firſt impreſſion was from a copy ſtolen by one of his domeſtics. If this be the caſe, the archbiſhop owes all the reputation which he has acquired to this breach of truſt; but to the ſame cauſe he is indebted for being ever after out of favour at court.

court. Some people have imagined they cou
trace in Telemachus an indirect critique upc
the government of Lewis XIV. Seſoſtris, tc
haughty in his triumphs; Idomeneus, wh
confirmed the reign of luxury in Salentum, an
neglected œconomy, were thought ſtrikin
portraits of that monarch: yet, after all, it w
impoſſible for him to have had a ſuperfluit
without an extraordinary cultivation of th
moſt eſſential and neceſſary arts. His miniſt
Louvois was found by the malecontents i
the character of Proteſilaus, who is repreſent
as vain, intractable, haughty, and an enemy
thoſe great generals who choſe to ſerve th
ſtate and not the miniſter.

The allies, who in the war of 1688 unit
againſt Lewis XIV. and who in 1701 ſhook
throne, traced his character with infinite pl
ſure in that Idomeneus, whoſe haughtineſs h
rendered him odious to all his neighbours. Th
alluſions made the deeper impreſſion, becauſe
the harmony of the ſtile, which ſo gently inſi
ates moderation and concord. Even the Fre
themſelves, as well as ſtrangers, tired out wit
many wars, found a malicious conſolation in t
ing a ſatire of this kind thro' a book meant tc
culcate the principles of virtue. The editior
it were innumerable: I have ſeen fourteen in F
liſh. It is true, that after the death of this mon
ſo feared, ſo envied, ſo reſpected by all, ſo h
by ſome, the malignity of mankind ceaſe
point out thoſe pretended alluſions which
ſured his conduct; and judges of the corr
taſte have treated Telemachus with ſev
They blamed it as tedious and circumſta
they alledged that there was too little co

tion in the adventures; that his deſcriptions of a country-life occur too often, and are too much of a piece; yet the book has been always eſteemed a fine monument of a flouriſhing age.

Among theſe may be always counted the Characters of la Bruiere. We have no copies of ſuch a work among the ancients, no more than of Telemachus. A ſtile rapid, conciſe, and nervous; expreſſions animated and pictureſque; an entire new uſe of language, without infringing any eſtabliſhed rules, now firſt ſtruck the eye of the public, and the alluſions, which every where occur in the courſe of the work, confirmed its ſucceſs. When la Bruiere ſhewed his work in manuſcript to Maleſieux, "It will procure you (ſaid he) many readers and many enemies." The reputation of this book was lowered in the public opinion, when the whole generation againſt which it was levelled was no more; yet, as there are in it many paſſages applicable to all times and all places, there is room to believe it will never be entirely forgotten. Telemachus has had ſome imitators; la Bruiere's characters many more. It is much eaſier to ſketch ſhort pictures of ſtriking things, than to produce a long work of imagination, which will at once both pleaſe and inſtruct.

The happy art of aſſociating the graces with philoſophy was a new thing, of which the Plurality of Worlds was the firſt ſpecimen; it was indeed a dangerous one, becauſe the native dreſs of philoſophy ſhould be compoſed of order, perſpicuity, and truth above all. There is nothing to hinder this ingenious work from being ranked among our claſſics by poſterity, but that it was partly founded upon Carteſius' chimerical doctrine of the vortices. To theſe literary novel-

ties may be added Bayle's new kind of reaſoning dictionary. It is the firſt work of this ſort, whence a man may be taught to think. We muſt indeed abandon to the fate of indifferent books ſuch articles as contain only trifling facts, unworthy of the character of Bayle, beneath the attention of a grave reader, or the regard of poſterity. It is neceſſary to obſerve, that in ranking Bayle among the authors who reflect honour upon the age of Lewis XIV. though he was baniſhed into Holland, I only conform to the decree of the parliament of Thouloufe, which in declaring his will valid in France, notwithſtanding the rigour of the laws, expreſsly ſays, "Such a man cannot be looked upon as a foreigner."

We ſhall not deſcant here upon the multitude of good books produced in this age; we ſhall only dwell upon ſuch new and ſingular productions of genius as characteriſe and diſtinguiſh it from all others. The eloquence, for example, of Boſſuet and Bourdaloue are not, nay cannot, be deemed ſimilar to that of Cicero. The merit, as well as the ſpecies, was entirely new. If any production of this æra comes near the Roman orator, the three pleadings of Peliſſon compoſed for Fouquet muſt take the place. They, like many of Sully's orations, are a mixture of judicial and ſtate matters, ſolidly handled with the fineſt yet ſcarcely diſcernible art, and the moſt affecting charms of oratory.

We have had hiſtorians, but none equal to Livy. The conſpiracy of Venice may rank with Salluſt: that he was the abbe de St. Real's model is evident, perhaps he has ſurpaſſed him. All the other writings of which we have been ſpeaking ſeem to have been of a new creation. And

it is this that ſo peculiarly diſtinguiſhes and characterizes the age of Lewis XIV. for the ſixteenth and ſeventeenth ages both have produced learned men and commentators, but true genius had not yet unfolded itſelf.

Who would believe that theſe excellent proſe works of which we have taken notice had probably never exiſted, had they not been preceded by poetry: yet ſuch has been the fate of human nature in all nations, that verſe has every where appeared as the firſt offspring of genius, and the parent of eloquence.

It is the ſame with men in general as in particular. Plato and Cicero began with verſifying. When every body had by heart ſome of Malherbe's ſtanzas, we had not one ſublime or noble paſſage in proſe to quote; and it is very likely the genius of proſe writers had never been known, without the aid of Peter Corneille.

This great man is the more to be admired, becauſe when he began to write tragedies, he had none but the very worſt models before him, and inaſmuch as theſe bad models were highly eſteemed, he may be ſaid to have been ſhut out of the road of ſucceſs; and, the more to augment his diſcouragement, they had a faſt friend in Cardinal Richelieu, the protector of men of letters, but not of taſte. He rewarded well the moſt miſerable ſcriblers, who are commonly ſycophants; and his natural haughtineſs of ſoul, which on other occaſions might have been nobly exerted, induced him to endeavour humbling men of real genius, which he viewed not without repining, as they ſeldom can ſtoop to dependence. It ſeldom happens that a man of power is a ſincere patron of the arts, when he himſelf is an artiſt.

Corneille had to ſtruggle with the times, his rivals, and the cardinal. I ſhall not rehearſe here all that has been ſaid about the Cid; let it ſuffice that the academy, in their judicious deciſions between Corneille and Scudery, had too much complaiſance for his eminence, and therefore condemned the love of Chimene. To love the murderer of her father, and yet perſiſt in avenging, was admirably fine. To have conquered her paſſion had been a capital defect in tragedy, the principal buſineſs of which is to pourtray the ſtruggles of the human heart. But, except to Corneille, the dramatic art was now entirely unknown. Nor was the Cid the only one of his works which the cardinal ſtrove to injure; the abbe Polignac tells us that Polieuctes alſo incurred his diſpleaſure. The Cid after all was a noble imitation, and in many places a tranſlation, of Guillain de Caſtro. I knew an old domeſtic of the Condé family, who ſaid, that at the firſt exhibition of Cinna, the great Condé being then only twenty years old, ſhed tears at theſe lines pronounced by Auguſtus:

Je ſuis maître de moi, comme de l'univers;
Je le ſuis, je veux l'être. O ſiécles! ô mémoire!
Conſervez à jamais ma nouvelle victoire.
Je triomphe aujourd'hui du plus juſte courroux,
De qui le ſouvenir puiſſe aller juſqu' à vous.
Soyons amis, Cinna; *c'eſt moi qui t'en convie.*

I'm now the world's great maſter and my own—
I am—I will be—memory and time
Shall this laſt, greateſt victory record.
I triumph over wrath too juſtly roua'd,
And lateſt age the conqueſt ſhall applaud—
Cinna, let us be friends—'tis I who aſk it.

Theſe were the tears of an hero. The great Corneille forcing tears of admiration from the eyes of the great Condé is a moſt celebrated epocha in the hiſtory of the human mind. The many pieces unworthy of himſelf which he afterwards publiſhed will never hinder the nation from regarding him as a great man, no more than the blemiſhes of Homer have prevented his being thought the ſublimeſt of poets. It is the privilege of true genius, more eſpecially when it ſtrikes out into a new path, to launch with impunity into conſiderable errors.

Corneille formed himſelf; but Lewis XIV. Colbert, Sophocles, and Euripides, all contributed to form Racine. An ode which he compoſed at the age of eighteen on the king's marriage, and for which he obtained an unexpected preſent, determined him in purſuit of poetry. His reputation encreaſed every day, that of Corneille diminiſhed, but not much. The reaſon is plain, Racine in all his performances ſubſequent to Alexander, is always correct, elegant, and natural; he ſpeaks to the heart. The other too often infringes upon theſe duties. Racine underſtood the paſſions much better than either the Greeks or Corneille; and he carried the ſmooth flow of verſification, as well as the graces of expreſſion, to the higheſt pitch poſſible. By theſe great men the nation was taught to think, feel, and expreſs; and their auditors, by them only inſtructed, became at length ſevere judges of what their firſt maſters produced. In the time of Cardinal Richelieu there were but few people in France capable of ſeeing into the faults of the Cid; and in 1702, when Athaliah, that maſter-piece of dramatic writing, was

was performed before the dutcheſs of Burgundy, the courtiers thought themſelves ſufficient critics to condemn it. Time has avenged this inſult for the author; but that great man died without ſharing in any part of the ſucceſs of this admirable compoſition.

There was ever a numerous party, which made a point of doing injuſtice to Racine. Madam de Sevigné, the firſt epiſtolary writer of her time, and who had particularly the art of expreſſing the mereſt trifles with grace, always ſaid that Racine's fame would never be great. She judged of him as ſhe did of coffee, with regard to the virtues of which ſhe ſaid the publſc would ſoon be undeceived. Time is requiſite to ripen reputations.

It was the particular fate of theſe days, that Moliere ſhould be cotemporary with Corneille and Racine. It is falſe that Moliere at his firſt appearance found the ſtage utterly void of good comedies. Corneille had produced his Liar, a piece taken from the Spaniſh, and fraught with ſpirit, character, and intrigue, and Quinault's Coquet-mother, a piece not only abounding with character and intrigue, but even the very model of intrigue had been exhibited, when only two of Moliere's moſt capital pieces were preſented. It made its appearance in 1664; and is the firſt comedy in which appears the character of a ſpecies of men called marquiſſes. Moſt of Lewis XIV's higheſt courtiers endeavoured to imitate the grandeur, ſplendour, and dignity of their ſovereign. Thoſe of an inferior claſs copied the exalted air of the nobility; and there were not wanting many, who carried their conceit and predominant deſire of being held in a much

a much higher light, than their pretenſions to the moſt ridiculous height of affectation.

This humour prevailed long. It was often attacked by Moliere, and it was to him principally the public owed their being freed from theſe conſequential men of no conſequence; as well as from the affectation of prudes; the pedantry of female learning; and the jargon of lawyers and phyſicians. Moliere was, if one may be permitted to uſe the expreſſion, the law-giver of politeneſs to the world. I only here ſpeak of the ſervices he did the age; every body knows ſufficiently his other merits. This was an æra worthy the attention of futurity, when the heroes of Corneille and Racine, the characters of Moliere, the muſical compoſitions of Lully, ſo very new to the nation (for we only ſpeak here of the arts) and the eloquence of Boſſuet and Bourdaloue, were exhibited before a Lewis XIV. a dutcheſs of Orleans, remarkable for the moſt finiſhed taſte, a Condé, a Turenne, a Colbert, and that croud of illuſtrious men, of every ſort, that now appeared. Thoſe times will never return, wherein a duke de la Rochefoucault, author of the Maxims, ſhall quit the converſation of a Paſcal and an Arnauld, to diſcourſe at the theatre with Corneille. It was by his fine epiſtles, ſo inſtructive to poſterity, and above all by his Art of Poetry, whence even Corneille might have deduced improvement, and not by his Satires, that Boileau raiſed himſelf to a rank with ſo many great men; for what have future generations to do with the Confuſion of Paris, or the names of Coſſaignes, and Cotin?

La

La Fontaine, leſs chaſte in his ſtile, leſs correct in his language, but inimitable in that ſprightlineſs, and thoſe graces peculiar to himſelf, which raiſed him by the ſimpleſt narrations, nearly to an equality with thoſe ſublime geniuſes.

Quinault, who excelled in a new mode of writing, the more difficult for its being apparently the more eaſy, richly deſerves a place amongſt theſe his illuſtrious cotemporaries. The injuſtice wherewith Boileau decried him is well known. Boileau had never learned to ſacrifice to the graces; and it was in vain, that he all his life fought to humble a man who was their moſt intimate acquaintance. The greateſt praiſe that can be given to a poet is to remember and repeat his verſes. Whole ſcenes of Quinault are in every body's mouth, an advantage at which the Italian opera could never arrive. French muſic has remained in a ſtate of ſimplicity, which is no longer the taſte of any nation; but thoſe ſimple and refined ſtrokes of nature which ſo frequently charm in Quinault, ſtill pleaſe, in every part of Europe, thoſe who are maſters of the French tongue and a poliſhed taſte. Had we found ſuch poems as an Armida, or an Atys, among the remains of antiquity, with what idolatry had they been read! but Quinault was a modern.

All theſe great men were known and protected by Lewis XIV. La Fontaine was not of the number. His extreme ſimplicity, which amounted even to forgetfulneſs, kept him at a diſtance from court, where he never, indeed, once thought of appearing. The duke of Burgundy found him out; and, in his old days,

days, he received many favours from that prince. He was, notwithſtanding his genius, as ſimple in his manners as the heroes of his fables. Puget, one of the fathers of the oratory, thinks he has great merit in treating this innocent, this artleſs man, as if he ſpoke of a Brinvilliers or a Voiſin. His tales are only from Poggius, Arioſto, and the queen of Navarre. If looſe ideas are dangerous, be it remembered that they are not inſpired barely by pleaſant ſallies of wit, or a lively imagination. One may apply to la Fontaine, his admirable fable of the beaſts ſick of the plague, where the lions, the wolves, and the bears, are pardoned every thing, and an innocent animal is devoured for having eaten a little graſs.

In the ſchool of theſe geniuſes, deſtined to be the delight and inſtruction of poſterity, were formed many men of wit, who have produced a multitude of elegant little pieces, which ſerve to amuſe people of taſte, juſt as we have ſeveral good painters who are yet unequal to Pouſſin, Le Sueur, Le Brun, Le Moine, and Vanloo.

But towards the end of Lewis XIV's reign, two men roſe ſuperior to the run of indifferent geniuſes, and acquired a great degree of reputation: the one was La Motte-Houdart, rather of a more ſolid and extenſive than a ſublime capacity. In proſe he was delicate and methodical; but in his poetry he often wanted that fire and elegance, even that correctneſs, the neglect of which is only to be diſpenſed with in favour of the ſublime. He has however given us ſome beautiful ſtanzas, for they cannot be properly called odes. His talents were not long-lived, yet

the

the many beautiful pieces he has left us of more than one kind are ſufficient to ſet him above authors of the loweſt claſs. In him is proved that in the art of writing ſome may rank as ſeconds. The other was Rouſſeau, who with leſs genius, leſs art, and facility than La Motte, had yet greater talents for verſification. His odes were ſubſequent to La Motte; but they are more beautiful, deverſified, and fuller of imagery. In his pſalms, he comes up to that rapture and harmony ſo remarkable in the canticles of Racine. His epigrams are better finiſhed than thoſe of Marot. He had leſs ſucceſs in opera, which requires ſenſibility; nor did he ſucceed in comedy, in which a ſpirit of gaiety is neceſſary. In theſe two characters he failed; therefore in theſe kinds of writing he did not ſucceed, becauſe they were foreign to his genius.

Had the antiquated ſtile of Marot, which he uſed in his ſerious works been imitated, he would have corrupted the French tongue; but happily that mixture of the purity of our language, with the obſolete dialect ſpoken above two hundred years before, did not long keep its footing. Some of his epiſtles are imitations of Boileau; but neither ſo eaſy in the expreſſion, nor ſo clear in the conception; nor are his truths obvious: truth only is amiable.

He loſt himſelf in foreign countries: whether his genius was impaired by his misfortunes, or whether his principal merit conſiſted in a choice of words and happy turns of expreſſion, perfections more neceſſary and uncommon than is generally imagined, he had not abroad the ſame advantages he might have found at home.

Ex-

Exiled from his native land, he might rank it among his misfortunes that he was no longer under the eye of ſevere criticiſm.

His long misfortunes had their foundation in an ungovernable ſelf-love, too much intermixed with jealouſy and animoſity. His example ſhould be a ſtriking leſſon to all men of talents; but we only conſider him here as a writer who has done no ſmall honour to letters.

We have had few great geniuſes ſince the flouriſhing days of theſe illuſtrious artiſts; and nature ſeemed as it were to repoſe herſelf ſome time before the death of Lewis the Great.

The road was difficult at the beginning of this age, becauſe untrodden; it is now open to every one, and become a common highway. The great men of the preceding century have taught us to think and ſpeak; they have informed us of things which were before unknown. But little is left to be ſaid by their ſucceſſors. In fine, the multitude of finiſhed pieces have given us a kind of ſatiety for literary productions.

The age of Lewis XIV. had in every thing therefore the fate of Leo X. of Auguſtus, and of Alexander. The ſoils which produced in theſe illuſtrious times ſo many fruits of genius, had been long before preparing to rear them. In vain have we ſearched out in cauſes moral and phyſical, the reaſon of this ſlow progreſſive fruitfulneſs, and of the long ſterility that enſued. The true reaſon is, that among the nations which cultivate the polite arts, it requires many years to purify their language and refine their taſte. When theſe preliminaries are adjuſted, then genius begins to bloom. Emulation and public

public favour laviſhed upon theſe new efforts excite every talent. Each artiſt in his particular ſphere ſeizes upon thoſe natural beauties which correſpond with his art. Whoever fathoms the theory of ſuch arts as depend purely upon genius, muſt, if he has any genius himſelf, know that the primary beauties, the grand natural outlines peculiar to ſuch arts, and which agree to the nation for which their talents are employed, are in number very confined. The ſubjects and their ſuitable embelliſhments have boundaries ſtill more contracted than is generally imagined.

The Abbe du Bos, a man of great good ſenſe, who, in 1714 compoſed a treatiſe upon poetry and painting, found not in the whole hiſtory of France one real ſubject for an epic poem, but the deſtruction of the league by Henry the Great. He ought to have added, that the ornaments of the epopæa adopted by the Greeks and Romans, and by Italians of the fifteenth and ſixteenth centuries, being proſcribed by the French writers; the fabulous deities, oracles, invulnerable heroes, monſters, ſorceries, metamorphoſes, romantic adventures, now all generally exploded, the beauties proper to epic poetry are confined within a very narrow circle. If therefore at any time a genius ſprings up who poſſeſſes himſelf of all the embelliſhments ſuitable to the times, ſubject, and nation, and carries into execution * what has

* Here the author alludes to his own poem, intituled, La Henriade. We cannot however ſubſcribe to his opinion or that of the critics, who ſuppoſe the epopæa depends ſo much

has been attempted, thoſe who follow him will find the taſk performed.

It is the ſame in tragic compoſitions. It is not to be ſuppoſed that ſublime paſſages and elevated ſentiments can be ſuſceptible of ſuch infinite variety as to be always new and affecting: every thing has its boundaries.

Nor is the caſe different with regard to true comedy; there is not in human nature above a dozen characters truly comic and highly marked. The abbe Du Bos, not having genius in himſelf, thinks that men of wit may ſtrike out a variety of characters that are all new; but he is miſtaken, they muſt ariſe from nature. He imagines that thoſe trifling peculiarities which conſtitute the different characters of men may be as happily handled as the moſt ſublime ſubjects. Innumerable are the clouds that over-

---

much on the machinery of the heathen Gods, &c. from the uſe of which we chriſtian authors are excluded: for granting the ſcene or plan of the work is laid within the pale of the church, the opinions and traditions of our own ſuperſtition ſupply the author with a fund of machinery as ample as any that antiquity can produce: we have our demons, fairies, ſorceries, prophecies, apparitions, dreams, and even metamorphoſes, with all the romantic adventures of chivalry, which, if properly exhibited, would produce as good an effect as the intervention of the Gods of Homer; which, in ſpite of all that has been ſaid in their defence, certainly outrage probability, and would be a diſgrace to any ſyſtem of religion. After all, notwithſtanding what Ariſtotle, Boſſu, Rapin, and other critics have ſaid of the fable and the machinery of the epic poem, we will venture to affirm that the ſucceſs of it does not ſo much depend upon the contrivance of the poet in theſe particulars, as upon the characters or manners, the imagery and verification of the performance.

ſhadow

ſhadow truth: her ſtrongeſt and moſt glaring colours are not many; but of ſuch of theſe as are of a primitive, a ſuperior nature, an able artiſt never fails ſo make a proper uſe*.

Pulpit oratory, particularly that which relates to funeral eulogium, is exactly in the ſame ſtate. Moral truths being once delivered with eloquence, the images of wretchedneſs and human weakneſs, the vanity of grandeur, and the devaſtations of death, being once drawn by maſterly hands, in time become common place. We are reduced to the neceſſity of imitating or erring from the point. A ſufficient number of fables being compoſed by a La Fontaine, all further additions enter into the ſame ſyſtem of morality; and the courſe of adventure is nearly the ſame. Thus genius, after flouriſhing for a certain age, muſt neceſſarily degenerate.

Thoſe kinds of ſcience whoſe ſubjects permit of perpetual renewal, ſuch as hiſtory and phyſical obſervations, and which require only induſty, judgment, and a common underſtanding, can more eaſily keep their ground; and the manual arts, ſuch as painting and ſculpture, can never degenerate, when the ſupreme governors, as Lewis XIV. are careful only to employ the beſt artiſts; for in painting and ſculpture the ſame ſubjects may be treated an hundred different ways. The holy family is drawn

* Without entering into a diſcuſſion of this point, whether nature has not produced more than a dozen original comic characters, we ſhall beg leave to obſerve that it is the buſineſs of comedy to paint the follies of the age; and every body knows, that the follies of life are infinitely varied, according to faſhion, time, and circumſtance.

every

every day, though it is a ſubject on which Raphael has diſplayed the utmoſt power of his art: but it would be ridiculous again to undertake a Cinna, an Andromache, an Art of Poetry, and a Tartuffe *.

It is alſo obſervable, that the laſt age having inſtructed the preſent, it is become ſo eaſy to write indifferent books, that we have been plagued with trifling pieces; and, what is ſtill worſe, many of them very ſerious and very uſeleſs. But amid this quantity of pieces of ſmall merit, an evil become neceſſary in a town like this, large, opulent, and idle, where one part of the people are always ſtriving to amuſe the other, there will from time to time be found excellent pieces, either of hiſtory or reflection, or of that ſuperficial kind of writing which amuſes every body †.

The

* We cannot think this is a fair compariſon. A picture appeals inſtantaneouſly to the eye, which enjoys it at the firſt glance: but a man muſt take ſome pains to make himſelf judge of a tragedy. A picture is a valuable piece of furniture, an original ornament, of which the owner is ſole poſſeſſor; an eighteen penny pamphlet makes no figure at all, and is beſides common to thouſands; a circumſtance that muſt greatly diminiſh its value. Yet we will be bold to ſay, that if the ſaid ſubject for tragedy was treated by a dozen different authors of eſtabliſhed reputation, we ſhould peruſe them all with pleaſure; and if there was but one copy of each, it would perhaps fetch as great a price as an original Madona.

† The writings of the preſent age have been undervalued, not from their mediocrity, but from their abundance. Genius is become cheap, becauſe the market is overſtocked. Mr. Pope was careſſed by the great as the firſt poet of the age. His friendſhip was courted by the firſt perſons in the nation; and his fortune was made at once by a liberal ſubſcription

The French nation has, above all others, produced moſt of theſe performances. Their language is become the language of Europe; every thing has contributed thereto; the celebrated writers of the age of Lewis the Great; the Calviniſt miniſters who were baniſhed, and carried eloquence and method into other countries; a Rapin de Thoyras, who publiſhed in French the only good hiſtory of England *; a St. Evremond, whoſe acquaintance was ſought by the whole Engliſh court; a dutcheſs of Mazarine, whom they were all zealous to pleaſe; and a madam d'Olbreuſe, afterwards dutcheſs of Zell, who carried into Germany all the perfections of her native country; but above all, that ſocial ſpirit which is the natural characteriſtic of the French, a merit and pleaſure of which other nations feel the want and neceſſity. The French tongue, above all others, expreſſes every ſubject of genteel converſation with more eaſe, correctneſs, and elegance, and thereby contributes, all over Europe, to the greateſt, the moſt amiable pleaſures of life.

ſcription. Let it not be imagined we want to detract from the memory or fame of this excellent writer, when we declare our opinion, that there are now living ſeveral authors equal to Pope in poetical merit, who have never felt one ray of patronage or protection.

* This aſſertion will, we hope, admit of a diſpute. Rapin reigned for ſome years, becauſe there was no competitor. The caſe is otherwiſe at preſent.

CHAP. CCV.

SEQUEL of the ARTS.

THE arts which do not depend abſolutely upon the mind, ſuch as muſic, painting, ſculpture, architecture, &c. made but ſmall progreſs in France before that æra which we diſtinguiſh by the name of the age of Lewis XIV. Muſic was as yet in its infancy; all that we knew were ſome ſongs, and a few airs for the violin, the guittare, and theorbo, moſt of which were compoſed in Spain. The taſte, the ſkill of a Lully, amazed the world; he was the firſt who in France introduced baſes, ſtops, and fugues. However early and ſimple his compoſitions may now appear, the executing of them muſt have coſt him ſome pains. There are at this time a thouſand people who underſtand muſic for one who was a proficient therein in the days of Lewis XIII. and the art has, by degrees, arrived at perfection *.

Few great towns are now without a public concert; whereas then there was not one, even in Paris. The king's band, of twenty-four violins, was all the muſic of France. The different ſpecies of ſcience belonging to muſic, and its dependent arts, made afterwards ſuch a progreſs, that, about the end of Lewis XIV's reign, the art of pricking down dances was invented; ſo that it may now be truly ſaid we dance by book.

* What muſic may have gained in compoſition, it ſeems to have loſt in expreſſion: for the modern refinements of this art are calculated to tickle the ear, rather than wake or aſſuage the paſſions of the heart.

Even

Even in the regency of Mary of Medicis, we had very good architects; ſhe built the palace of Luxembourg in the Tuſcan ſtile, to do honour to her own country and embelliſh ours. That Deſbroſſes to whom we owe the portal of St. Gervais, ſuperintended alſo the ſtructure of that queen's palace, which ſhe never enjoyed. It is a miſtake to ſuppoſe that cardinal Richelieu, with equal greatneſs of ſoul, came near her in taſte. His palace, which now belongs to the crown, is a proof of this aſſertion. When that beautiful front of the Louvre, which with regret we ſtill behold unfiniſhed, was firſt raiſed, we conceived the warmeſt expectations. Many magnificent buildings have been erected by citizens, which have been more highly finiſhed within than without, and which contribute more to gratify the luxury of individuals than to the embelliſhment of the city.

Colbert, the Mecenas of arts, founded an academy of architecture in 1671. It is not enough to have Vitruviuſes, we muſt alſo have Auguſtuſes to employ them.

It is alſo neceſſary, that the municipal magiſtrates ſhould be men of public ſpirit, and poſſeſſed of taſte. Two or three ſuch mayors of Paris as the preſident Turgot, would have prevented the reproach now caſt upon that city, on account of the town-houſe, ſo badly built, and ſo ill ſituated; of the public ſquares, ſo ſmall and irregular, remarkable only for executions and bonfires; and of the principal ſtreets, ſo extremely narrow: and, in fine, for thoſe remains of barbarity, ſtill ſubſiſting in the midſt of grandeur and the very boſom of the arts.

Painting began with Pouſſin, in the days of Lewis XIII. It is not worth while to take notice of the indifferent artiſts in that way who preceded him. We have always ſince his time had excellent painters; tho' not indeed in that abundance which conſtitutes part of the wealth of Italy. Suppoſe we ſhould paſs over the name of le Sueur, who had no maſter but himſelf, or le Brun, who, in deſign and compoſition, equalled the Italians; yet we can boaſt of more than thirty painters, who have left behind them pieces worthy of the moſt accurate attention. Foreigners begin to purchaſe them of us. I have ſeen the galleries and grand apartments of a great monarch, which have been adorned only with pictures of our country's produce, of whoſe merit we were not perhaps ſufficiently acquainted. I have ſeen in France twelve thouſand livres refuſed for a picture of Santerre. Europe cannot boaſt a greater, nor perhaps a more elegant, piece of painting than the cieling at Verſailles by le Moine.

Foreigners allow a painter now among us to be the firſt in Europe. Colbert not only gave to the academy of painting its preſent form, but prevailed alſo upon Lewis XIV. to eſtabliſh one at Rome, in 1667. An houſe was there purchaſed for the ſuperintendant. Scholars are ſent thither who have obtained the premium in the academy at Paris. They are ſent and maintained at the king's expence; they deſign after antiques, and ſtudy the works of Raphael and Michael Angelo. This ambition of imitating its treaſures is a noble homage paid to ancient and modern Rome; and we ſtill continue it, notwithſtanding the immenſe

menſe collection of Italian pictures made by the duke of Orleans and the king, and thoſe maſter-pieces of ſculpture, which France has produced, ſets us above the ſearch after foreign aſſiſtance.

We have principally excelled in ſculpture, and in the art of caſting, in metal, coloſſal equeſtrian figures.

Should there hereafter be diſcovered in ruins ſuch maſter-pieces of art as the baths of Apollo, expoſed to all the injuries of the weather in the gardens of Verſailles; the tomb of cardinal Richelieu in the chapel of the Sorbonne, not ſufficiently pointed out to the public; the equeſtrian ſtatue of Lewis XV. made at Paris, to embelliſh Bourdeaux; the Mercury ſent by the preſent king of France as a preſent to his majeſty of Pruſſia, and other performances equal in merit to thoſe I have named, is it not probable they would ſet this age in a light as advantageous as the moſt poliſhed æra of ancient Greece?

We have equalled the ancients in our medals. Varin was the firſt who raiſed this art above mediocrity, about the end of the reign of Lewis XIII. The number and variety of theſe pieces, which we ſee ranged in hiſtorical order in that part of the gallery of the Louvre aſſigned to the artiſts, is admirable. There are above two millions, and moſt of them very maſterly.

Nor have we been leſs ſucceſsful in the art of engraving precious ſtones. That of multiplying pictures upon copper, and tranſmitting with eaſe to poſterity all the repreſentations of art and nature, was, before this time, in a very

imperfect ſtate in France. It is one of the moſt uſeful and pleaſing arts; we are indebted for it to the Florentines, among whom it was invented about the middle of the fifteenth century; and it has been more improved in France than Italy: we have a vaſt number of finiſhed works of this kind. The king's collection of prints has been often conſidered as one of the moſt magnificent preſents that could be given to ambaſſadors. Chaſing in gold and ſilver, which depends much upon invention and taſte, has been carried to the higheſt perfection of which the hand of man is capable.

Having thus traverſed thoſe arts which contribute to the delight of individuals, and the glory of a ſtate, let us not paſs over in ſilence one of the moſt uſeful of all others, in which France ſurpaſſes all nations of the world; I mean ſurgery, the progreſs of which was now ſo rapid and celebrated, that people crowded to Paris from all parts of Europe for thoſe cures and operations which require uncommon dexterity of hand. And, beſides that good ſurgeons were to be found ſcarcely any where but in France, it was the only country in which the inſtruments neceſſary to that art were properly finiſhed. They ſupplied all their neighbours; and the celebrated Cheſelden, one of the greateſt ſurgeons in London, told me, that it was he who firſt cauſed them to be manufactured in that city, in 1715. Phyſic, which contributes to perfect the chirurgical art, did not make a ſwifter progreſs in France than in England, and under Boerhaave in Holland. But we may ſay of phyſic as of philoſophy, that, by making uſe of the lights communicated to us

by

our neighbours, we have raiſed it to the greateſt poſſible perfection.

Thus have I given a general and faithful portrait of the progreſs of human genius among the French in this age, which began under cardinal Richlieu, and ended with our own times. It will be difficult to ſurpaſs it: if by any means it ſhould happen, this will always remain a model for thoſe more fortunate ages to which it may give birth.

CHAP. CCVI.

ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS: MEMORABLE DISPUTES.

IT has been always neceſſary for the ſovereign to act with more delicacy and caution towards the church, the moſt numerous of the three orders compoſing the ſtate, than any other. To preſerve at the ſame time an union with the ſee of Rome, and ſupport the liberties of the Gallican church, which are the rights of the antient church, that is, to make the biſhops obey as ſubjects, without infringing their epiſcopal immunities, to oblige them to ſubmit in many things to the ſecular juriſdiction, and to leave them judges in others, to make them contribute to the exigencies of the ſtate without injuring their privileges; all this required a compound of dexterity and reſolution of which Lewis XIV. was always maſter. The clergy of France were by degrees reduced to a ſtate of

order and decency, from which the civil wars and the licentiouſneſs of the times had cauſed them to deviate. The king would no longer permit laymen to poſſeſs benefices *in commendam*; nor any to be biſhops unleſs they were prieſts, as the cardinal Mazarin, who had held the biſhopric of Metz, when not even a ſub-deacon, and the duke de Verneuille, who enjoyed the profits thereof, though a layman.

The money paid one year with another to the king, by the clergy of France and the conquered towns, amounted to about two millions five hundred thouſand livres; and, ſince the numerical increaſe of the value of money, they have aſſiſted the ſtate yearly with about four millions, under the name of tenths, extraordinary ſubſidies, and free-gifts. The name and privilege of free-gift is ſtill preſerved as one of the remains of ancient cuſtom, whereby the lords of fiefs were wont to contribute to the neceſſities of the ſtate, by way of free-gift to the king. In the time of feudal anarchy, biſhops and abbots, being lords of fiefs, were only obliged to furniſh ſoldiers. Kings then, like other lords, lived upon the revenue of their own domains: afterwards, when every other order changed, the clergy remained upon their old footing, and maintained the cuſtom of aſſiſting the ſtate by way of free-gift.

To this ancient cuſtom, which a body that aſſembles often, eaſily preſerves, and which muſt be neceſſarily loſt by one that never aſſembles, we may join that immunity and maxim, always claimed by the church, That its revenues are thoſe of the poor. Not that it pretends to owe nothing to the ſtate, of which it holds every thing,

thing, becauſe, when the public is neceſſitated, it is to be conſidered in the firſt claſs of poor: and Lewis XIV. exacted theſe ſupplies in ſuch a manner, that he was ſure of never being refuſed.

It it amazing to all Europe as well as to France, that the clergy, who are ſuppoſed to be poſſeſſed of one third of the revenue of the kingdom, ſhould contribute ſo little to relieve its wants. If they are maſters of one third of the whole, it is indiſputable that they ought to pay one third of the expences, which, upon an average, amounts, demonſtrably, to thirty millions yearly, beſides the duties upon periſhable commodities, which they pay in common with other ſubjects; but vague and partial judgments are paſſed upon every thing. The people talk of the clergy poſſeſſing one third of the kingdom's revenues at random, juſt as they ſay Paris contains a million of inhabitants.

Were we but to take the pains of computing the revenues of the biſhoprics, by the leaſes granted about fifty years ago, it would appear, that the whole annual revenue did not then exceed four millions; and the commendatory abbies amounted to about four millions five hundred thouſand pounds. It is true, the leaſes were eſtimated at one third of their real value, and if to this eſtimation we add the increaſe of the landed revenue ſince, the ſum total of the conſiſtorial benefices will amount to ſixteen millions; and it ſhould not be forgotten, that out of this there goes annually a conſiderable ſum to Rome, which, as it never comes back, is abſolutely loſt to us. The king is herein extremely liberal to the holy ſee; by which the

ſtate is plundered, in the ſpace of a century, of more than 400,000 marks of ſilver, which could not in time fail to impoveriſh the kingdom, were not the loſs abundantly repaired by the returns of commerce. To theſe benefices which pay annates to Rome muſt be annexed cures, convents, collegiate livings, and all other eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments; and, if we compute the value of all together at fifty millions yearly, we ſhall not fall far ſhort of the truth.

Thoſe who have inquired into this matter with the utmoſt accuracy and attention cannot carry the ſum total of the yearly revenues of the Gallican church, ſecular and regular, farther than eighty millions. This is no exorbitant ſum when appropriated to the maintainance of ninety thouſand regulars, and about one hundred and ſixty thouſand other eccleſiaſtics, which was the caſe in 1700: and moreover, out of the above ninety thouſand, more than one third live upon alms and maſſes. Many conventual monks do not ſtand their community in two hundred livres yearly: there are regular abbots, whoſe income each annually amounts to two hundred thouſand livres. From this enormous and ſtriking inequality, murmurs muſt neceſſarily ariſe. It is really lamentable, that a country curate ſhall, from his laborious duties, be only intitled to a ſcanty income of three hundred livres, (and perhaps he ſhall receive from Chriſtian liberality not more than four or five hundred livres beſides,) while a lazy monk, become an abbot, but not on that account the leſs lazy, and is maſter of an immenſe fortune, receiving at the ſame time from his inferiors the moſt flattering and pompous titles. Theſe abuſes are carried much

much higher in Flanders, Spain, and above all in the catholic ſtates in Germany, where we often find princes among the regular religious.

Abuſes almoſt every where paſs by degrees into laws; and if the wiſeſt men were to aſſemble to compoſe laws, where is that kind of ſtate whoſe conſtitution would always remain unalterably the ſame?

The clergy of France always obſerve a cuſtom that is very burthenſome to them when they aſſiſt the king with a free-gift of ſeveral millions for a certain term of years. They borrow the money, and reimburſe their creditors with the capital, after having paid the intereſt; thus paying it twice over. It would be more to the advantage of the ſtate, as well as of the clergy in general, and more conformable to reaſon, if this reverend body were to aſſiſt the wants of their country by contributions proportioned to the value of their reſpective benefices: but we are always too much attached to old cuſtoms. It is owing to this diſpoſition that the clergy, though they aſſemble every five years, have never yet had a hall, nor any one thing they could call their own. It is clear, that with leſs expence to themſelves, they might have more effectually ſerved the king, and have erected a palace in Paris, which might have been a new ornament to that capital.

In the minority of Lewis XIV. the maxims of the clergy of France were not entirely cleared from the impurities they had imbibed from the League. It is well known, that in the younger days of Lewis XIII. and in the laſt aſſembly of the ſtates, held in 1614, the moſt numerous

part of the nation, diſtinguiſhed by the appellation of the third ſtate, and which is as it were the foundation of the ſtate, in vain demanded of the parliament, that it ſhould be regiſtered as a fundamental law, "That no ſpiritual power can deprive kings of their ſacred rights, which they hold only from God; and that it is high treaſon of the blackeſt kind to teach the doctrine of depoſing and killing kings." This was the ſubſtance of the nation's demand, in nearly the ſame words. It was made when the blood of Henry the Great ſtill ſmoaked. Yet a biſhop of France, born in that kingdom, the cardinal du Perron, oppoſed violently the propoſition, under pretence that it was not the buſineſs of the third ſtate to dictate laws that any way concern the church. Why did he not then, in conjunction with them, agree to this point? but he was ſo far from this as to ſay, "That the power of the pope was plenary without controul, direct as to ſpiritual matters, indirect as to temporals; and he was alſo commiſſioned by the clergy to add, they would excommunicate all ſuch perſons as might pretend to maintain that the pope could not depoſe kings."

The nobility was gained over, and the third ſtate obliged to deſiſt. The parliament renewed their antient decrees, declaring the crown independent, and the king's perſon ſacred. The eccleſiaſtical chamber, in acknowledging the king's perſon to be ſacred, ſtill perſiſted to maintain that the crown was dependent. The very ſame temper had before depoſed Lewis the Debonnaire. It now prevailed ſo far, that the court was obliged to acquieſce, and impriſon the printer who had publiſhed the decree of par-

parliament, under the title of, The fundamental law. This proceeding was ſaid to be neceſſary for the public peace; but it was really meant to puniſh thoſe who furniſhed the crown with defenſive arms. The caſe was quite different at Vienna, becauſe France ſtood in awe of the court of Rome, and the pope was afraid of the houſe of Auſtria.

The cauſe here given up was ſo much the cauſe of kings, that James I. king of England, wrote againſt cardinal Perron; and this piece is the beſt of his works. It was alſo the cauſe of the people, whoſe ſafety required that their ſovereign ſhould by no means depend upon a foreign power. Reaſon at length prevailed; and Lewis XIV. with the weight of his authority, found no great trouble in procuring it to be heard.

Antonio Perez had recommended to Henry IV. three things, Rome, Conſejo, Pielago. Lewis XIV. had attained to ſuch a ſuperiority in the two laſt, he had no need of the firſt. He was particularly careful to preſerve the cuſtom of appealing to parliament, from the decrees of eccleſiaſtical courts, in all caſes reſpecting the regal juriſdiction. The clergy ſometimes complained of this proceeding, and ſometimes applauded it: for if on the one hand theſe appeals ſupport the rights of the ſtate againſt epiſcopal authority, they yet confirm that authority itſelf, in maintaining the rights of the epiſcopal church againſt the pretenſions of the court of Rome: inſomuch that the biſhops have looked upon the parliament both as their adverſaries and defenders; and the government has been careful, that, in ſpite of the quarrels of religion,

ligion, the boundaries, which are eaſily broken down, ſhould on neither ſide be infringed. It is with regard to the different bodies and companies of the ſtate the ſame as with the intereſt of trading towns; to ballance them is in the hand of the legiſlator.

The moſt important and delicate affair of this ſort, was that of the Regale. The kings of France have a right to preſent to all ſimple benefices of a dioceſe during the vacancy of the ſee, and alſo for that time to appropriate the revenues to their own uſe. This prerogative is peculiar to the kings of France; but every ſtate has its privileges. The kings of Portugal enjoy one third of the revenues of every biſhop in their dominions. The emperor claims the firſt fruits, and diſpoſes of all livings when they become firſt vacant after his acceſſion. The rights of the kings of Naples and Sicily are ſtill greater. Thoſe of the court of Rome are founded rather upon cuſtom than primitive title. The kings of the Merovingian race gave away livings and biſhoprics of their own ſole authority. It appears very juſt they ſhould preſerve the poor privilege of diſpoſing of the revenue, and nominating to ſimple benefices during the ſhort ſpace that happens between the death of one biſhop and the regiſtering his ſucceſſor's oath of fidelity.

The biſhops of ſeveral towns, reunited to the crown under the third race, refuſed to acknowledge this right, which their former lords had been too weak to maintain. The popes ſided with the biſhops, and their claims always remained enveloped in obſcurity. The parliament under Henry IV. in 1608 declared, that the

the Regale ſhould take place throughout the whole kingdom. The clergy murmured; and that prince, who temporiſed with the biſhops and court of Rome, brought the affair before his council, but took care it ſhould not be decided.

The cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin cauſed ſeveral orders of council to be iſſued, whereby thoſe biſhops who held themſelves exempt from that authority were required to produce their titles. The affair remained undecided even in the year 1673; and the king at that time did not dare to diſpoſe of a ſingle benefice in almoſt any dioceſe beyond the Loire, during the vacancy of a ſee. At length, in 1673, the chancellor Michael le Tellier publiſhed an edict, whereby all the biſhoprics in the kingdom were declared ſubject to the Regale. Two biſhops, who were unhappily the moſt virtuous men in the kingdom, obſtinately refuſed to ſubmit. Theſe were Pavillon biſhop of Alet, and Caulet biſhop of Pamiers. They defended their cauſe at firſt with very plauſible reaſons, and were as ſtrongly oppoſed. When men of underſtanding diſpute long, it is very likely the queſtion is far from being clear. This was indeed very obſcure: but it was evident, that neither religion nor good order were intereſted in preventing the king from doing in two dioceſſes what he did in every other. Nevertheleſs, the two biſhops remained inflexible. Neither one nor the other of them had cauſed his oath of fidelity to be regiſtered; and the king thought he had a right to diſpoſe of the livings vacated in their reſpective ſees.

The

The two prelates excommunicated all who were thus provided for. Both had been ſuſpected of Janſeniſm. Innocent X. was their enemy; but when they diſputed againſt the king's prerogative, he became their friend. This pope, Odeſcalchi, as virtuous and obſtinate as themſelves, warmly eſpouſed their cauſe.

The king at firſt contented himſelf to exile the principal officers of theſe biſhops. He ſhewed more moderation than two men who piqued themſelves for their ſanctity. Out of reſpect to his old age, the biſhop of Alet was left to die in peace. The biſhop of Pamiers ſtill reſiſted, nor could any remonſtrances move him. He repeated his excommunications; and perſiſted in not regiſtering his oath of fidelity, perſuaded that by ſuch an oath the church was acknowledged as ſubſervient to monarchy. His temporalities were ſeized upon by the king. The pope and the Janſeniſts indemnified him. He gained by the privation of his annuity, and died in 1680, ſatisfied, that in oppoſing the king, he had maintained the cauſe of heaven. His death did not extinguiſh the quarrel: the canons named by the king came to take poſſeſſion; the monks, who pretended to be canons and grand vicars, obliged them to quit the church, and excommunicated them. The metropolitan, Montpeſat, archbiſhop of Toulouſe, to whom it belonged to take cognizance of this matter, gave ſentence, but to no purpoſe, againſt theſe pretended grand vicars. They appealed to Rome, according to the cuſtom of referring to that court ſuch eccleſiaſtical cauſes as were determined by the archbiſhops of France, a cuſtom directly contrary to the liberties of the Gallican church:

church: but there are contradictions in every form of human government. The parliament iſſued decrees. A monk named Cerle, who was one of theſe grand vicars, broke thro' the ſentence of the archbiſhop, as well as the decrees of the parliament. This laſt tribunal condemned him to be drawn on a ſledge to the place of execution, and to loſe his head. He was executed in effigy. From his aſylum he inſulted both the archbiſhop and the king; and was ſupported by the pope. Nay, this ſovereign pontiff went farther. Perſuaded, like Pamiers, that the right of Regale was an abuſe upon the church, and that the king had nothing to do with the livings of that vacant biſhopric, he repealed the ordonnances of the archbiſhop of Toulouſe, and excommunicated the grand vicars named by that prelate, with all the eccleſiaſtics that held under the Regale, and their abettors.

The king convened an aſſembly of the clergy, conſiſting of thirty-five biſhops, and a like number of deputies of the ſecond order. The Janſeniſts for the firſt time took part with the pope; and this pope, an enemy to the king, favoured, without loving them; he piqued himſelf for oppoſing this monarch upon every occaſion: and, in 1689, joined with the allies againſt James II. becauſe he was protected by Lewis XIV. ſo that it was now a common ſaying, That James ſhould become an huguenot, and the pope a catholic, to terminate the troubles of Europe and of the church.

In the mean time the clergy in 1682, unanimouſly declared for the king. Another trifling quarrel, become now important, engaged the

the public attention. The election to a priory in the ſuburbs of Paris inflamed the differences between the pope and the king. The Roman pontiff repealed the ordonnance of the archbiſhop of Paris, and annulled his nomination to that priory. The parliament adjudged this proceeding of the court of Rome to be an abuſe. The pope, by a bull, ordered the inquiſition to burn the parliament's decree. Theſe diſputes have been for a long time the common and inevitable conſequences of that ancient mixture of the natural liberty which every country claims of governing within itſelf, and of its ſubſerviency to a foreign power.

The aſſembly of the clergy took a courſe, which ſhews that men of wiſdom can yield with dignity to their ſovereign, without any other power interpoſing. They conſented that the right of Regale ſhould extend over the whole kingdom; but it was done in ſuch a manner as to ſeem rather a conceſſion on the part of the clergy, relinquiſhing their pretenſions out of regard to their protector, than a formal acknowledgment of the abſolute right of the crown.

The aſſembly juſtified themſelves to the pope by a letter, wherein we find this one paſſage, which alone ought to ſerve as a conſtant rule in all diſputes, viz. "It is better to cede ſome thing of one's rights, than to diſturb the public tranquility." The king, the Gallican church, and the parliament, were contented. The Janſeniſts writ ſome libels: the pope continued inflexible. He reverſed by brief all the reſolutions of the aſſembly, and commanded the biſhops

ſhops to retract their conceſſions. Here was ſome foundation for dividing for ever the church of France from that of Rome. There had been ſome talk of making a patriarch in the times of cardinal Richelieu and Mazarin.

It was the wiſh of every magiſtrate, that the tribute of annates ſhould be no longer paid to Rome; that the holy ſee ſhould nominate to the benefices of Bretagne only for ſix months in the year; and that the biſhops of France ſhould no longer be ſtiled biſhops by permiſſion of the holy ſee. Had it been the king's inclination, he needed only to have ſaid the word; he was maſter of the aſſembly of the clergy, and the nation was for him. Rome would have loſt all by the inflexibility of a virtuous pope, who knew not how to temporiſe. But there are certain ancient boundaries which cannot be removed without the moſt violent ſhocks. It required ſtronger ties of intereſt, more inflamed paſſions, and greater perturbations in the minds of men, to break at once with the court of Rome; and this rupture would have been the more difficult while the miniſtry perſiſted in extirpating Calviniſm. It was even looked upon as a bold ſtep to publiſh the four famous deciſions of the ſame aſſembly in 1682, of which here follows the ſubſtance.

1. God gave no power, either directly or indirectly, in temporal matters, either to Peter or his ſucceſſors.

2. The Gallican church approved of the council of Conſtance, which declares general councils ſuperior to the pope in ſpirituals.

3. The

3. The rules, cuſtoms, and eſtabliſhed practices of the kingdom, and the Gallican church, ought to remain unchangeable.

4. The pope's deciſions in matters of faith are not binding, until approved of by the church.

All the tribunals and faculties of theology regiſtered theſe four propoſitions in their fulleſt ſenſe, and forbid by edict any one to maintain the contrary. This firmneſs was regarded at Rome as an effort of rebellion; and by the proteſtants of Europe as a weak eſſay of a church naturally free, which had broken only four links of her chains. Theſe four maxims were at firſt eſpouſed with enthuſiaſm by the whole nation; but they afterwards cooled.

About the end of Lewis the Great's reign, they began to be conſidered as problematical; and cardinal Fleury cauſed them to be in part diſavowed by an aſſembly of the clergy, without the leaſt conſequential murmur, becauſe the minds of men were not then ſo much heated, and becauſe during the adminiſtration of cardinal Fleury, nothing was done very remarkable.

Pope Innocent was nevertheleſs more than ever exaſperated: he refuſed bulls to all the biſhops and commendatory abbots that had been nominated by the king; ſo that when he died, which was in 1689, there was twenty-nine ſees in France without biſhops. Theſe prelates indeed were not without their revenues; but they dared not either to be conſecrated, or enjoy any of the epiſcopal functions. The notion of creating a patriarch was revived. The quarrel about the rights of ambaſſadors at Rome, which compleated the widening of theſe breaches,

breaches, gave one reaſon to think that the time was come for eſtabliſhing in France a catholic apoſtolic church that was not Roman. The attorney-general, Harlai, and the advocate-general, Talon, made themſelves ſufficiently underſtood, by appealing, in 1687, from the bull againſt the franchiſes, as an abuſe, and exclaiming againſt the obſtinacy of the pope, who left ſo many churches without paſtors. This was a ſtep to which the king never could agree, though it might have been eaſily done, notwithſtanding it appeared ſo very difficult.

The cauſe of Innocent XI. became now the cauſe of the holy ſee. The four propoſitions of the clergy of France attacked the phantom of infallibility, (which though not believed in at Rome, yet was there ſupported) and the real power annexed to that phantom. Alexander VIII. and Innocent XII. followed the ſteps of the obdurate Odeſcalchi, not indeed with ſuch violence. They confirmed the judgment pronounced againſt the aſſembly of the clergy: they refuſed bulls to the biſhops; and in fine did too much, becauſe Lewis XIV. had not done enough. The biſhops, weary of enjoying no more than a regal nomination, without the exerciſe of their epiſcopal functions, intreated the court of France to permit them to appeaſe that of Rome.

The king, whoſe reſolution was worn out, allowed their requeſt. Each of them wrote ſeparately to the court of Rome, expreſſing themſelves grievouſly afflicted with the proceedings of the aſſembly; and each of them in his letter declared he did not look upon that matter as decided, which they had before abſolutely

ſolutely decided; nor upon that to be eſtabliſhed which they had really eſtabliſhed. Pignatelli, (Innocent XII.) more mild than Odeſcalchi, was ſatisfied with this proceeding. The four propoſitions were yet from time to time not leſs taught in France. The cauſe ſubſided when diſputes were ceaſed; yet it only lay dormant without being determined, as is always the caſe in a ſtate, which has not in ſuch matters invariable and acknowledged principles. Thus we ſometimes oppoſe, ſometimes give way to Rome, according to the characters of thoſe who govern, or the particular intereſts of thoſe who are at the head of the adminiſtration.

Lewis XIV. had no other kind of eccleſiaſtical quarrel with the court of Rome; nor had he any oppoſition from the clergy in temporal matters.

Under him the clergy became reſpectable by a decency of behaviour unknown to the barbarous times of the two firſt races of our kings, to the ſtill more barbarous times of feudal government, abſolutely unknown during the civil wars, and above all during the Fronde. There are indeed ſome few exceptions, which will be always the caſe according to the prevailing virtues or vices. It was now only that the eyes of the people began to be opened upon the ſuperſtitions which always mingle with their religion. It was no longer accounted criminal to aſſert that Lazarus and Mary Magdalen never were in Provence, whatever might be the opinion of the parliament of Aix, or of the Carmelites. The Benedictines could no longer perſuade the people that Dionyſius the Areopagite

gine governed the church of Paris. Pretended saints, false miracles, and supposed relics began to be decried. That sound reasoning which had thrown such lights upon philosophy, made its way every where but slowly, and with difficulty.

Gaston Lewis de Noailles, brother to the cardinal and bishop of Chalons, in 1702 had sufficient sensible piety to cause to be thrown away a relic which had been many ages carefully preserved in the church of Notre-Dame, worshipped under the name of Jesus Christ's navel. All Chalons murmured against the bishop. Presidents, counsellors, king's officers, treasurers of France, merchants, citizens, canons, curates, unanimously and formally protested against this bold action of the bishop; affirming that the garment of Christ, preserved at Argenteuil, the handkerchief at Turin and Laon, the nail of the cross at St. Dennis, and the prepuce at Rome, were identically his. But the bishop's wise resolution triumphed at length over the credulity of the people.

Some other superstitions, because united with respectable customs, still subsisted. The protestants have therefore exulted; but they are obliged to acknowledge, that there is no catholic church in which abuse is less common, or more despised than in France.

The true philosophical spirit, which had not taken root till about the middle of this century, could not extinguish the ancient and modern disputes in theology, of which it did not take cognizance. We shall now proceed to speak of those dissentions which are a disgrace to human reason.

CHAP.

CHAP. CCVII.

Of CALVINISM.

IT is undoubtedly a melancholy conſideration that the church has been always torn by inteſtine diviſions, and that ſo much blood ſhould have been for ſo many ages ſhed by thoſe who proclaimed the God of peace. This rage was unknown to paganiſm. It covered the earth with darkneſs, but ſcarcely ſpilt any other blood than that of animals; and if human victims were ſometimes offered up among the Jews and Pagans, ſuch offerings, horrible as they are, never occaſioned civil wars. The religion of the Pagans was compoſed of morality and feſtivals. Morality, which is common to all men, and all ſeaſons; and feſtivals, which are only acts of rejoicing, could never diſturb mankind.

The ſpirit of dogmatiſm inſpired men with the rage of civil war. I have often enquired how and by what means that dogmatic ſpirit, which divided the ſchools of Pagan antiquity, without occaſioning any diſturbance, ſhould among us produce ſuch horrible diſorders. It cannot be cauſed ſolely by fanaticiſm; for the Gymnoſophiſts and Bramins, the moſt fanatic of mankind, never hurt any but themſelves. Cannot then the origin of this new plague, which has ravaged the earth, be found in that republican ſpirit which animated the primitive churches? Thoſe ſecret aſſemblies, which from caves and grottoes defied the authority of the Roman emperors, by degrees formed a ſtate within

ſtate within a ſtate. It was a republic concealed in the boſom of the empire. Conſtantine drew it from under ground, and ſet it by the ſide of the throne.

The authority annexed to great ſees was ſoon found to run counter to the ſpirit of popularity, which had till then inſpired all the chriſtian aſſemblies. It often happened that when a metropolitan uttered one opinion, a ſuffragan biſhop, a prieſt, or a deacon, maintained the direct contrary. All authority ſecretly hurts mankind, inaſmuch as that authority is always upon the encreaſe. When people can find a pretext that may be deemed ſacred, they ſoon make a duty of oppoſition.* Thus one party becomes perſecutors, the other rebels, while on both ſides they pretend to maintain the cauſe of God. We have ſeen by the diſputes ſupported by Arius againſt a biſhop, how the rage

* All the miſchiefs of religious zeal are, we apprehend, deducible from the ſingle doctrine of faith, implying, that our eternal happineſs or miſery depends upon our believing or diſbelieving certain tenets, concerning which the faculty of reaſon cannot be exerciſed. This it was which opened a way to every ſpecies of fanaticiſm and ſpiritual rancour: for thoſe who adopted this tenet conſidered every perſon who differed from them in opinion, as reprobated and accurſed; and mutual hatred, animoſity, and perſecution enſued. As the concerns of the ſoul were much more intereſting than any thing that related to temporal eſtabliſhments, the ſpiritual guides acquired ſuch influence over the minds of the Neophytes, as often ſuperſeded the authority of the civil magiſtrates; a circumſtance which could not fail to arouſe the jealouſy of the government under which they lived; and this jealouſy was attended with ſeverity, which ſerved only to inflame the ſpirit of enthuſiaſm, and engender rebellion and deſpair.

of governing ſouls has diſturbed the peace of the earth. To deliver an opinion as agreeable to the will of heaven, to command it to be believed under pain of death, temporal and eternal, was in ſome men deemed the utmoſt period of ſpiritual deſpotiſm; and to reſiſt theſe two menaces was in others thought the laſt effort of independence.

In the general hiſtory we have run through, we have ſeen a continual ſtruggle between the ſecular and eccleſieſtical juriſdiction, ever ſince the time of Theodoſius; and ſince that of Charlemagne, the grand fiefs continually ſtruggling againſt their ſovereigns; biſhops often riſing againſt kings, and popes taking part ſometimes with biſhops, ſometimes with kings. In the firſt ages they diſputed leſs in the Latin church. The continual invaſions of barbarians ſcarcely gave them time to think; and few of their dogmatical opinions were ſufficiently clear to ſecure them univerſal credit. The worſhip of images was almoſt every where rejected in the Weſt, in the age of Charlemagne. A biſhop of Turin, named Claudius, inveighed againſt them with great acrimony, and maintained ſeveral opinions which at this time give foundation to the proteſtant credit. Theſe opinions ſpread themſelves in the vallies of Piedmont, Dauphiny, Provence, and Languedoc. They flouriſhed in the twelfth century; ſoon afterwards produced the wars of the Albigenſes; and having paſſed thence to the univerſity of Prague, excited the wars of the Huſſites.

The interval between the troubles which aroſe from the aſhes of John Hus and Jerom of Prague, and the diſturbances renewed by

by Luther, was not more than one hundred years. The ancient opinions embraced by the Vaudois, the Albigenſes, and the Huſſites, revived and differently explained by Luther and Zwinglius, were eagerly adopted in Germany, as they furniſhed pretence for ſeizing on the many lands poſſeſſed by the biſhops and abbots, and for reſiſting the power of the emperor: they triumphed in Sweden and Denmark, countries wherein people were free under their kings.

The Engliſh, who inherit from nature a ſpirit of independence, adopted, moulded them, and thence compoſed a religion for themſelves. Theſe opinions made their way in Poland; and their progreſs was conſiderable only in places where the people were not ſlaves. They found little difficulty in being received among the Swiſs, becauſe the government was republican. For the ſame reaſon they were near being eſtabliſhed at Venice; and might have perhaps taken actual root there, had not Rome been ſo near; and if the government had not dreaded a democracy, at which the people in every republic naturally aſpire, and which was the chief view of moſt of the reformers. The Hollanders ſhook off the yoke of Spain * before they embraced this religion. Geneva became a popular ſtate by receiving Calviniſm. The houſe of Auſtria took all poſſible pains to prevent theſe religions from getting footing in their dominions. They ſcarcely made any progreſs

* The Dutch did not firſt throw off the Spaniſh yoke, and then embrace the proteſtant religion; they were firſt converted to this doctrine, and finding themſelves oppreſſed in the point of liberty of conſcience, then ſhook off the yoke of Spain.

in Spain. They were extirpated with fire and ſword in the dukedom of Savoy, which was their cradle. In 1655 the inhabitants of the vallies of Piedmont underwent the ſame cruel trials which thoſe of Merindol and Cabriere had underwent under Francis I. in France.

This ſect having appeared dangerous to the duke of Savoy, he abſolutely exterminated it; ſo that there remained only ſome few, ſcarcely known, in the moſt rocky and deſert places. It does not appear that the Lutherans and Calviniſts cauſed any great troubles in France, under the dominion of Francis I. and Henry II. But when the government was weak and divided, the quarrels of religion became violent. Conde and Coligni became Calviniſts, becauſe the Guiſes were Catholics, overwhelmed the ſtate with confuſion. The levity and impetuoſity of the nation, their paſſion for novelty and enthuſiaſm, changed us for upwards of forty years from a moſt poliſhed to a moſt barbarous people. Henry IV. born of this ſect, which he really loved, without being bigotted to any, could not, though ſeconded by his victories and virtues, obtain the crown without abandoning Calviniſm. After he became a catholic, he had not the ingratitude to conſent to the deſtruction of a people, to whom, though they were at variance with monarchical government, he owed his crown; and even had he been inclined to it, he could not now have diſperſed this faction; he therefore cheriſhed, protected, and reſtrained it.

The Huguenots of France did not at this time amount to a twelfth part of the nation. But among them were many powerful lords; whole

whole cities were proteſtants. They had made war upon their ſovereigns, who had been obliged to put ſome ſtrong places into their hands for ſecurity. Henry III. had given up to them in Dauphine alone, fourteen; Montauban and Niſmes in Languedoc; Saumur, and above all Rochelle, which made a republic of itſelf, and had become powerful by the commerce and protection of the Engliſh. At length Henry IV. ſeemed to act according to his inclination as well as his duty, and even politically, by granting them in 1598, the celebrated edict of Nantz. This edict was in reality no more than a confirmation of privileges which the proteſtants had obtained ſword in hand from preceding kings, and which Henry the Great confirmed to them voluntarily from the throne. By this edict of Nantz, which the name of Henry the Great renders more celebrated than any other, every lord of a fief veſted with power of capital juriſdiction, was permitted the full exerciſe, within his own caſtle, of the pretended reformed religion. Every lord, not poſſeſſed of ſuch power, was allowed thirty perſons to be preſent at divine ſervice. The full exerciſe of this religion was tolerated in every place under the immediate juriſdiction of a parliament.

The Calviniſts were free to print books in every place where their religion was permitted, without applying to their ſuperiors. They were declared capable of holding all the great offices and dignities of ſtate; and every thing on their ſide appeared favourable, the king having created the lords of Trimcuille and Roni dukes and peers of France.

A new chamber was purpoſely formed in the parliament of Paris, conſiſting of a preſident and ſixteen counſellors. This court, which was called the Chamber of the Edict, took cognizance of, and determined all cauſes that concerned the reformed, not only in the immenſe diſtrict of Paris, but likewiſe in that of Normandy and Brittany. Indeed there never was but one Calviniſt admitted by right among the counſellors of this juriſdiction; but as the principal deſign of it was to prevent thoſe vexatious actions of which the party complained; and as men always value themſelves upon diſcharging a truſt by which they are diſtinguiſhed, this chamber, though compoſed of catholics, always rendered the moſt impartial juſtice to the Huguenots, as they themſelves acknowledged.

They had a kind of leſſer parliament at Caſtres, independent on that of Toulouſe. They had likewiſe courts of juſtice at Grenoble and Bourdeaux, compoſed of one half Roman Catholics and the other Calviniſts. Their churches aſſembled in ſynods in the ſame manner as the Gallican church. Theſe privileges, together with many others, incorporated the Calviniſts with the reſt of the nation. It was in effect ſuffering enemies to league together; but the authority, the goodneſs, and the addreſs of this great monarch, kept them within bounds during his life.

After the tragical and much lamented death of Henry IV. during the weakneſs of a minority, and under a divided court, it was hardly poſſible for the republican ſpirit of the reformed not to abuſe their privileges, or for the court, feeble as it was, not to attempt to reſtrain them.

them. The Huguenots had already eſtabliſhed circles in France, in imitation of thoſe in Germany. The deputies of theſe circles were frequently men of a ſeditious turn, and there were in the party itſelf ſeveral noblemen of unbounded ambition. The duke of Bouillon, and above all the duke de Rohan, the chief who was in the greateſt credit among the Huguenots, ſoon hurried the reſtleſs ſpirit of the preachers and the blind zeal of the people, into an open revolt. The general aſſembly of the party in 1616 had the boldneſs to preſent a remonſtrance to the court, in which, among other inſolent articles, they demanded a change in the king's council. In the ſame year 1616, they took up arms in ſeveral places, and through the audacious behaviour of the party, joined to the diviſions in the court, the public hatred againſt the favourites, and the unſettled ſtate of the nation, every thing was for ſome time in the utmoſt diſorder and confuſion. Nothing prevailed but ſeditions, intrigues, menaces, inſurrections, treaties made in haſte, and broken as ſpeedily, which made the famous cardinal Bentivoglio, at that time nuncio in France, ſay, that he had been witneſs of nothing but ſtorms.

In the year 1621, the calviniſt churches of France offered Leſdigueres, that ſoldier of fortune, who was afterwards made conſtable, the command of their armies, with a ſalary of an hundred thouſand crowns a month. But Leſdiguieres, who was more clear-ſighted in his ambition than they in their factions, and who knew them well, as having commanded them before, choſe rather at that time to fight againſt them than be at their head, and inſtead of ac-

ing their offers, turned catholic. The party afterwards applied to the marechal duke of Bouillon, who returned for anſwer, that he was too old. To conclude, they conferred that unhappy employment on the duke of Rohan, who jointly with his brother Soubiſe had the inſolence to make war upon the king of France.

The ſame year the conſtable de Luines carried Lewis XIII. from province to province. He reduced to obedience upwards of fifty cities, almoſt without reſiſtance, but failed before Montauban, whence the king had the mortification of being obliged to decamp. Rochelle was beſieged in vain; that city continued to defend itſelf both by its own ſtrength and the ſuccours it received from England: and the duke de Rohan, a traitor to his country, concluded a peace with his ſovereign, like one crowned head treating with another.

After this peace, and the death of the conſtable de Luines, there was a neceſſity of renewing the war, and Rochelle was again beſieged; that city, which was always in league againſt its ſovereign with the Engliſh, and the Calviniſts of the kingdom. A woman, (the mother of the duke of Rohan,) defended this city a whole year againſt the king's army, againſt the active diligence of cardinal Richelieu, and the intrepid valour of Lewis XIII. who braved death more than once at this ſiege. The city ſuffered all the extremities of famine, and would not have been reduced at laſt, had it not been for the mole of five hundred feet long, which cardinal Richelieu ordered to be made acroſs the mouth of the harbour, in imitation of that which Alexander the Great formerly raiſed

raiſed before the city of Tyre. This ſtupendous work at once ſubdued the ſea and the Rochellers. Guiton, the mayor of Rochelle, who had formed the deſign to bury himſelf under the ruins of the place, had the boldneſs, after having ſurrendered at diſcretion, to appear before cardinal Richelieu, attended by his guards, the mayors of the principal Huguenot cities being allowed this mark of honour. Guiton's guards however were taken from him, and the city was diveſted of its privileges. The duke of Rohan, chief of the rebellious heretics, ſtill continued the war againſt his prince; and finding himſelf abandoned by the Engliſh, though proteſtants, he entered into an alliance with the Spaniards, though catholics. But the firm behaviour of cardinal Richelieu forced the Huguenots at laſt, after being defeated on all ſides, to ſubmit.

All the edicts granted them before this time, having been ſo many treaties made with their kings, Richelieu reſolved that the one he granted them on this occaſion ſhould be called The Edict of Grace. The king in it ſpeaks in the ſtyle of a prince who pardons. The exerciſe of the new religion was forbid in Rochelle, the Iſle of Rhé, Oleron, Privas, and Pamiers; in other reſpects the edict of Nantz was ſuffered to remain; which, by the Calviniſts, was always looked upon as their fundamental law.

It ſeemed ſomewhat ſtrange that cardinal de Richelieu, who was ſo abſolute and daring, did not totally aboliſh this famous edict; but at that time he had ſomething elſe in view, more difficult perhaps in the execution, but not leſs conformable to the extent of his ambition and

the loftineſs of his deſigns. He aimed at the glory of ſubduing the minds of men, which he thought himſelf capable of effecting by the greatneſs of his underſtanding, his power, and his politics. His project was to gain the miniſters, to bring them firſt to acknowlege that the Roman-catholic worſhip was not criminal in the ſight of God; to lead them afterwards by degrees, to give up ſome points of little importance, and to appear in the eyes of the court of Rome as if he had yielded nothing at all. He made ſure of dazzling one party of the reformed, of ſeducing the other by preſents and penſions, and to appear at length to have united them to the church; leaving to time to accompliſh the reſt, and indulging himſelf in the glorious proſpect of having effected, or prepared the way for this great work, and paſſing for the author of it. The famous father Joſeph on one ſide, and two miniſters he had gained on the other, ſet about this negociation. But it appeared that the cardinal had made too ſure; and that it is more difficult to adjuſt the differences of divines, than to raiſe moles in the ocean.

Richelieu, thus diſappointed, reſolved entirely to cruſh the Calviniſts; but cares of another nature hindered him from carrying his deſign into execution. He found himſelf obliged to combat, at the ſame time, all the grandees of the kingdom, the royal family, the whole houſe of Auſtria, and frequently Lewis XIII. himſelf. At length, amidſt all theſe ſtorms, he ended his days by a premature death, before he was able to complete his vaſt deſigns, leaving behind him

him a name more dazzling than dear and venerable.

In the mean time, after the taking of Rochelle, and the publication of the Edict of Grace, the civil wars ceaſed, and their remained only a trifling controverſy. Large volumes were publiſhed on both ſides, which nobody reads at preſent. The clergy, and eſpecially the Jeſuits, aimed at converting the Huguenots. The Huguenot preachers endeavoured to bring over ſome catholics to their opinion. The king's council was buſied in iſſuing arrets about a burying-ground, which the two parties were diſputing in a village; about a chapel built on ſome ground formerly belonging to the church; about ſchools, the juriſdiction of caſtles, interments, bells, and the like; in which the reformed ſeldom gained their cauſe. Theſe trifling diſputes were all now left of the former devaſtations and ravages. The Huguenots were without a leader, ſince they had left the duke of Rohan, and that Sedan had been taken from the houſe of Bouillon. They even made a merit of remaining quiet during the factions of the Fronde, and the civil wars excited by the princes of the blood, the parliaments, and the biſhops, when they pretended to make the king an offer of their ſervice againſt cardinal Mazarine.

There were ſcarce any diſputes about religion during the life of this miniſter. He made no ſcruple to beſtow the place of comptroller-general of the finances upon a Huguenot of foreign extraction, named Hervard. The reformed were all of them admitted into the offices of the revenue without exception.

Colbert, who revived the induſtry of the nation, and whom France may look upon as the founder of her commerce, employed a great number of Huguenots in arts, manufactures, and the navy. Theſe uſeful engagements, which fully occupied them, ſoftened by degrees the epidemic fury of controverſy; and the glory which, for fifty years together, ſurrounded the throne of Lewis XIV. added to his power, and the firmneſs and vigour of his adminiſtration, extinguiſhed in the Calviniſt party, as well as in all orders of the ſtate, the leaſt idea of reſiſtance. The magnificent feaſts of a gay and gallant court threw an air of ridicule on the pedantry and reſerve of the Huguenots. In proportion as good taſte improved, the pſalms of Marot and Beza began to inſpire diſguſt. Theſe pſalms, which had charmed the court of Francis II. ſeemed only calculated for the populace in the reign of Lewis XIV. Sound philoſophy, which began to make its way in the world towards the middle of this age, helped ſtill more to put men out of conceit with religious diſputes.

But while reaſon was gradually extending her influence over men, the ſpirit of controverſy itſelf became inſtrumental in preſerving the peace of the ſtate: for the Janſeniſts beginning about this time to appear with ſome reputation, they acquired a conſiderable ſhare in the eſteem of thoſe who are fond of ſuch ſubtleties. They wrote at the ſame time againſt the Jeſuits and Huguenots; the latter anſwered the Jeſuits and the Janſeniſts. The Lutherans in the province of Alſace attacked all the three. A paper-war among ſo many different ſects, at a time

time when the ſtate was engaged in great deſigns, and the government was powerful, could not fail of becoming, in a few years, only an amuſement for the idle part of the nation, which, ſooner or latter, always ſinks into indifference.

Lewis XIV. was exaſperated againſt the ſectaries in religion, by the continual remonſtrances of his clergy, by the court of Rome, and eſpecially by the chancellor le Tellier and his ſon Louvois, both enemies to Colbert, and who had reſolved to root out the reformed as rebels, becauſe Colbert protected them as uſeful ſubjects. Lewis, wholly a ſtranger to the fundamental points of their doctrine, looked upon them, not without reaſon, as old revolters not entirely quelled. He applied himſelf at firſt to undermine by degrees, and on all ſides, the fabric of their religion: churches were taken from them on the moſt ſlender pretexts, and forbid to marry the daughters of catholics; but in this they ſeemed to want policy, or at leaſt to be ignorant of the power of a ſex with which the court was otherwiſe ſo well acquainted. The intendants and the biſhops endeavoured, by the moſt plauſible contrivances, to get Huguenot children away from their parents. Colbert had orders, in 1681, not to admit any perſon of this religion into places in the revenue. They were excluded as much as poſſible from the corporations of arts and trades. The king, however, though he kept them under the yoke, did not always make them feel the whole weight of it. Edicts appeared, forbidding all violence againſt them; inſinuations were mingled with ſeverities, and the oppreſſions they laboured

boured under were at leaſt covered with a ſhew of juſtice.

One very efficacious inſtrument of converſion was particularly uſed upon this occaſion, which was money; but they did not make a ſufficient uſe of the expedient. Peliſſon had the charge of this ſecret ſervice; the ſame Peliſſon who was ſo long a Calviniſt, and who is ſo well known by his writings, his copious eloquence, and his attachment to the ſuperintendant Fouquet, whoſe ſecretary, favourite, and victim, he was. He had the good fortune to be convinced of his errors, and to change his religion, at a time when that change opened a way to fortune and preferment; he took the eccleſiaſtical habit, and obtained ſeveral benefices, and the place of maſter of requeſts. About the year 1677, the king entruſted him with the revenues of the abbies of St. Germain des Prez, and Cluni, together with the revenues ariſing from the third part of all ſavings; the whole to be diſtributed amongſt thoſe who would become converts. Cardinal le Camus, biſhop of Grenoble, had already tried this method. Peliſſon, charged with this negociation, ſent money into the provinces, recommending at the ſame time to thoſe who had the care of diſtributing the ſums, to make as many converts as poſſible with a little expence. Small ſums diſtributed to a few indigent wretches ſwelled the liſt, which Peliſſon preſented every three months to the king, perſuading him at the ſame time, that every thing upon earth would at length give way to his generoſity and power.

The council, encouraged by theſe ſmall ſucceſſes, which time would have rendered more con-

conſiderable, adventured in 1681 to iſſue a declaration, permitting children to renounce their religion at the age of ſeven years: under the ſhadow of this decree, great numbers of children were ſeized in the provinces, in order to make them abjure; and troops were quartered upon the houſes of their parents.

This precipitate ſtep of the chancellor le Tellier and his ſon Louvois was the occaſion, that, in 1681, a great many families of Poitou, Saintonge, and the neighbouring provinces, abandoned the kingdom.

Strangers with eagerneſs took advantage of this circumſtance; the kings of England and Denmark, and the city of Amſterdam in particular, invited the Calviniſts to take refuge in their territories, promiſing them ample ſubſiſtance. Amſterdam alone undertook to build a thouſand houſes for ſuch as ſhould fly thither for an aſylum.

The council ſoon perceived the dangerous conſequences of a too ſpeedy uſe of authority, and thought to find a remedy in that very authority. They were ſenſible how neceſſary artiſans were in a country where commerce flouriſhed, and ſeamen at a time when they were eſtabliſhing a naval force. The puniſhment of the gallies was therefore denounced againſt all of theſe profeſſions who ſhould attempt to quit the kingdom.

It being obſerved that a great number of Calviniſt families ſold their eſtates, a proclamation immediately appeared, confiſcating all thoſe eſtates, in caſe the ſeller ſhould leave the kingdom within a year. The perſecution againſt the miniſters was now reſumed with double ſeverity.

verity. Their churches were ſhut up upon the moſt frivolous pretences, and all the rents left by will to their conſiſtories, were applied to the hoſpitals of the kingdom.

The maſters of Calviniſt ſchools were forbid to receive boarders. The miniſters were taxed, and proteſtant mayors were deprived of their right of nobleſſe. The officers of the king's houſhold, and the king's ſecretaries, who were proteſtants, had orders to reſign their places. None of this religion were any longer admitted, either among the notaries, attorneys, or advocates.

The clergy were ſtrictly enjoined to uſe their utmoſt endeavours to make proſelytes, while perpetual baniſhment was denounced againſt thoſe proteſtant miniſters who ſhould make any. All theſe ordonnances were publicly ſollicited by the clergy of France, who, like children of a houſhold, were reſolved not to ſhare their inheritance with aliens introduced by force.

Peliſſon went on buying converts; but Mad. Hervard, widow of the comptroller-general of the finances, animated with that zeal for religion which has been obſerved in all ages to belong to the women, ſent as much money to prevent converſions as Peliſſon had done to procure them.

1682 At length the Huguenots took courage, and roſe in ſome places. They aſſembled in the Vivares and in Dauphiny, near the places where their churches had been demoliſhed. They were attacked, and they defended themſelves. This was a ſmall ſpark of the fire of our ancient civil wars. Two or three hundred miſerable wretches, without a leader, without

without towns, and even without any regular plan of deſign, were diſperſed in a quarter of an hour. Their puniſhment immediately followed their defeat. The intendant of Dauphiny cauſed the grandſon of the miniſter, Chamier, who had drawn up the edict of Nantz, to be broke upon the wheel. He is ranked among the moſt famous martyrs of the ſect; and the name of Chamier has been long held in veneration by the proteſtants.

The intendant of Languedoc cauſed the miniſter Chomel to be broke upon the wheel. Three more were condemned to the ſame puniſhment, and ten to be hanged; but they ſaved themſelves by flight, and were only executed in effigy. 1683.

All theſe rigorous proceedings inſpired terror, and at the ſame time encreaſed the ſpirit of obſtinacy. It is but too well known, that people become more attached to a religion in proportion as they ſuffer for its ſake.

And now it was, that thoſe about the king inſinuated to him, that, after having ſent miſſionaries into all the provinces, it behoved him likewiſe to ſend dragoons. Theſe violences ſeemed very ill timed, and were the conſequences of the ſpirit which then prevailed at court, that every thing ought to ſubmit to the will of Lewis XIV. Theſe counſellors never conſidered that the Huguenots were no longer the ſame as at Jarnac, Moncontour, and Coutras; that the rage of civil war was now extinguiſhed; that this malady, of long continuance, was now upon the decline; that every thing has its limited time of duration with mankind; that, if the fathers had been rebels under

Lewis

Lewis XIII. their children were become good ſubjects under Lewis XIV. It was ſeen in England, Holland, and Germany, that many ſects, who had torn each other in pieces during the laſt age, now lived peaceably together within the walls of the ſame city. Every thing proved, that an abſolute prince might be equally well ſerved by catholics and by proteſtants. The Lutherans of Alſace were unanſwerable proofs of this maxim. In the end, it appeared, that queen Chriſtina was not miſtaken in what ſhe ſays, in one of her letters on the ſubject of theſe oppreſſions and deſertions: "I look upon France as a patient, whoſe phyſicians order his legs and arms to be cut off, to cure him of a diſorder which patience and mild treatment would have entirely got the better of."

Lewis XIV. who, in ſeizing upon Straſburg in 1681, engaged to protect Lutheraniſm, might have acted in the ſame manner by Calviniſm; which time would have inſenſibly aboliſhed, as it every day diminiſhes the number of Lutherans in Alſace. Could it be imagined, that in putting this force upon a great number of his ſubjects, he would not loſe many more, who, in ſpite of all his edicts and guards, would by flight avoid a violence which they looked upon as a horrible perſecution? and, in fact, why ſhould a million of people be compelled to hate a name ſo dear and precious, and to which both proteſtants and catholics, Frenchmen and ſtrangers, had agreed to join the epithet of Great? Policy itſelf ſeemed to require a toleration of the Calviniſts, in order to oppoſe them to the continual pretenſions of the court of Rome. It was about this very time too, that the king had openly broke

broke with pope Innocent XI. the declared enemy of France. But Lewis reconciling the intereſts of his religion with thoſe of his grandeur, was reſolved to humble the pope with one hand, and cruſh the Calviniſts with the other.

He conſidered theſe two enterprizes as productive of that luſtre of glory, of which he was in all things fond even to a degree of idolatry. The biſhops, ſeveral of the intendants, and the whole council, made him believe that his troops would, by their bare appearance, finiſh what his liberalities and miſſions had already begun.

He thought that in this he did no more than make uſe of his authority; but thoſe to whom that authority was committed, exerted it with extreme rigour.

Towards the end of the year 1684, and in the beginning of 1685, when Lewis XIV. always ſtrongly armed, had nothing to fear from any of his neighbours, troops were ſent into all the cities and caſtles where the proteſtants were moſt numerous; and as the dragoons, who at that time were very ill diſciplined, committed the greateſt exceſſes, this execution was called the Dragonade.

All poſſible care was taken to guard the frontiers, in order to prevent the flight of thoſe who were deſigned to be reunited to the church. It was a kind of chace carried on within a large encloſure.

A biſhop, an intendant, a ſubdelegate, a curate, or ſome other perſon in authority, marched at the head of the ſoldiers. The principal Calviniſt families were aſſembled, eſpecially thoſe who were deemed moſt tractable. They re-

renounced their religion in the name of the reſt, and thoſe who continued obſtinate were given up to the ſoldiery, who had every licence but that of killing; nevertheleſs, many perſons were ſo cruelly treated, that they died ſoon after. The poſterity of the refugees in foreign countries ſtill cry out againſt this perſecution of their fathers, comparing it to the moſt violent the church ever ſuſtained in the firſt ages of Chriſtianity.

It ſeemed a ſtrange contraſt, that ſuch cruel and mercileſs orders ſhould proceed from the boſom of a voluptuous court, diſtinguiſhed for ſoftneſs of manners, the graces, and all the charms of ſocial life. The inflexible character of the marquis de Louvois appeared too plainly in this affair; and we ſee in it the ſame genius which had propoſed to bury Holland under the waves, and afterwards laid waſte the Palatinate with fire and ſword. There are ſtill extant, letters written with his own hand in the year 1685, and conceived in theſe terms: "It is the king's pleaſure, that ſuch as refuſe to conform to his religion ſhould be puniſhed with the utmoſt rigour, and particularly thoſe who affect the fooliſh glory of being the laſt to comply."

Paris was not expoſed to theſe vexations; the cries of the ſufferers would have made themſelves heard too near the throne.

While the churches of the reformed were thus every where demoliſhed, and abjurations were demanded in the provinces with an armed force, the edict of Nantz was at laſt revoked, in the month of October 1685: this completed the ruin of that fabric which was already undermined on all ſides.

The

The Chamber of the Edict had been ſuppreſſed ſome time before, and the Calviniſt counſellors in parliament were ordered to reſign their places. Arrets of council followed one upon another, like thunderbolts, to extirpate the remains of the proſcribed religion. That which appeared to be the moſt fatal was the order for ſeizing the children of the pretended reformed, and putting them into the hands of their neareſt catholic relations; an order againſt which the voice of nature cried ſo loudly, that it was never carried into execution.

But in this celebrated edict, which revoked that of Nantz, they ſeem to 1685 have paved the way to an event directly contrary to the end propoſed. The intent was to procure a re-union of the Calviniſts to the national church throughout the kingdom. Gourville, a man of conſummate judgment, whom Louvois conſulted in this affair, adviſed that miniſter, as is well known, to impriſon all the preachers, and releaſe ſuch only, as being gained by private penſions, would abjure in public, and might by this means contribute more to the deſired union than the miſſionaries and ſoldiers. Inſtead of following this politic advice, an edict was iſſued, ordering all the miniſters who refuſed to renounce their religion to quit the kingdom in fifteen days. It was ſurely the utmoſt blindneſs to imagine that in driving away the paſtors, a great part of the flock would not follow. It was preſuming extravagantly upon power, and betraying a very ſlender knowlege of mankind, to ſuppoſe that ſo many ulcerated hearts, ſo many imaginations heated with the idea of martyrdom, eſpecially in the ſouthern parts

parts of France, would not run all riſks to go and publiſh their conſtancy, and the glory of their exile, in foreign countries, when ſo many nations, envious of Lewis XIV. were ready to receive them with open arms.

The old chancellor le Tellier, when he ſigned the edict, cried out in an ecſtaſy of joy: *Nunc dimittis ſervum tuum, Domine, quia viderunt oculi mei ſalutare tuum.* "Lord now letteſt thou thy ſervant depart in peace, for my eyes have ſeen thy ſalvation." He did not imagine that he was then ſetting his hand to an act, which would be productive of the greateſt miſchief to his country *.

His ſon, Louvois, was no leſs deceived, when he thought that a bare order of his would be ſufficient to ſhut the frontier-paſſes and ſea-ports, againſt thoſe who thought their duty obliged them to fly. Induſtry, when employed to elude the law, is always too ſtrong for authority. The gaining over ſome few of the guards was ſufficient to favour the flight of a number of refugees. No leſs than fifty thouſand families quitted the kingdom in the ſpace of three years; and were afterwarde followed by others, who carried their arts, manufactories, and riches,

* In reading the funeral-oration of this chancellor, pronounced by Boſſuet, we ſee him repreſented as a good and a great man. If we look into the Annals of the abbé de St. Pierre, we ſhall find him a mean-ſpirited and dangerous court-ſycophant, one particularly ſkilful in the art of calumniating, of whom the count de Grammont ſaid one day, on ſeeing him come out from a private conference with the king: "Methinks I ſee a fox that has juſt been devouring a brood of chickens, and is liking his lips, ſtained with their blood."

into

into other countries with them. Almoſt all the north of Germany, a country till then rude and void of induſtry, received a new face from the multitudes tranſplanted thither, who peopled whole cities. Stuffs, gold and ſilver lace, hats, ſtockings, formerly bought of France, were now manufactured in thoſe countries by them. A part of the ſuburbs of London was peopled entirely with French manufacturers in ſilk, others carried thither the art of making chryſtal in perfection, which was about this time loſt in France. The gold which the refugees brought with them, is ſtill very frequently to be met with in Germany *.

Thus France loſt about five hundred thouſand inhabitants, an immenſe quantity of ſpecie, and what is ſtill more, the arts with which her enemies enriched themſelves. Holland gained excellent officers and ſoldiers. The prince of Orange, and the duke of Savoy, had entire regiments of refugees. Some went even as far as the Cape of Good Hope to ſettle. The nephew of the famous du Queſne, lieutenant-general of the marine, founded a ſmall colony at that extremity of the globe; but it did not proſper, for moſt part of thoſe who went on board periſhed by the way.

In vain the priſons and galleys were filled with thoſe who were ſtopt in their flight; what could be done with ſuch a multitude of wretches whom ſufferings made more bold? how could

* The count d'Avaux, in his letters, ſays he was informed, that at London there were ſixty thouſand guineas coined with the gold which the refugees had ſent over thither; but this account is too much exaggerated.

perſons

perſons bred to the law, and infirm old men, be left to periſh in the galleys? Some hundreds were ſent over to America: at length the council began to think, that if they no longer prohibited leaving the kingdom, the minds of the people being no longer inſtigated by the ſecret pleaſure of diſobeying, deſertions would become leſs frequent. But here they were again miſtaken, and after leaving the paſſages open, guards were a ſecond time planted to no purpoſe.

After all the churches of the reformed were demoliſhed and their paſtors baniſhed, nothing more remained but to retain in the Roman communion, ſuch as through fear or perſuaſion had quitted their religion. There were about four hundred thouſand of theſe in the kingdom *. Theſe were obliged to go to maſs, and to communicate; ſome who refuſed the hoſt after having once received it, were burnt alive. The bodies of ſuch as refuſed to receive the ſacrament at their death were drawn upon a hurdle, and left unburied.

Perſecution always makes proſelytes, eſpecially when it happens to encounter a heat of enthuſiaſm. The Calviniſts aſſembled every where to ſing their pſalms, though the penalty of death was denounced againſt all ſuch as ſhould hold theſe aſſemblies. Miniſters returning into

* It has been ſeveral times aſſerted in print, that there ſtill remained three millions of the reformed in France. This is an inſufferable exaggeration; Mr. Baville reckoned but one hundred thouſand in Languedoc, and his account is exact. There are not above fifteen thouſand in Paris, and there are ſeveral cities, and even whole provinces, in which there is not one.

the kingdom were likewiſe to ſuffer death, and a reward of fifty-five thouſand livres was promiſed to whoſoever ſhould inform againſt them. Several returned, and were either hanged or broke upon the wheel.

The ſect, however, ſtill ſubſiſted, though in appearance cruſhed. It vainly hoped in the war of 1689, that king William, who had dethroned his father-in-law, who was a Roman catholic, would ſupport Calviniſm in France; but in the war of 1701, fanaticiſm and rebellion again broke out in Languedoc.

It was now ſome conſiderable time ſince, in the mountains of Cevennes and Vivares, certain perſons had appeared, pretending to the gifts of inſpiration and prophecy. An old Huguenot named des Serres had there kept a ſchool of prophets. He directed children to thoſe words of ſcripture: "When two or three are met together in my name, my ſpirit ſhall be in the midſt of them; and if you had faith like a grain of muſtard ſeed, you would be able to remove mountains." He afterwards received the ſpirit, was beſide himſelf, fell into convulſions, his voice changed, he became immovable, with his hair ſtanding on end, according to the ancient uſage of all nations, and the rules of prophetic madneſs, handed down from generation to generation. The children under his care thus received the gift of prophecy; and if they were not able to remove mountains, it was becauſe they had faith enough to receive the ſpirit, but not to work miracles; accordingly they redoubled their zeal and fervour to obtain this laſt gift.

Whilſt the Cevennes was thus the ſchool of enthuſiaſm, ſome of the miniſters called apoſtles returned ſecretly to preach among the people.

Claude Brouſſon, of a conſiderable family in Nimes, a man of eloquence, of great zeal, and in the higheſt eſteem among ſtrangers, returned to preach in his own country in 1698. He was convicted, not only of preaching contrary to the edicts, but of having about ten years before held private correſpondence with the enemies of the ſtate. The intendant Baville condemned him to be broke upon the wheel. He
1688 died after the manner of the firſt martyrs. All thoſe of his own ſect, and even all foreigners, far from conſidering him as a criminal of ſtate, ſaw in him only a ſaint, who had ſealed the faith with his blood.

After this, prophets began to ſtart up every where, and the ſpirit of phrenzy redoubled. Unhappily in 1703, an abbé of the family of Chaila, an inſpector of the miſſions, obtained an order from the court, to ſhut up in a convent two daughters of a gentleman lately converted. Inſtead of conveying them to the convent, however, he carried them to his own caſtle. The Calviniſts took the alarm, flocked together in crouds, broke open the doors, and ſet the two young ladies at liberty, with other perſons, they found confined there. They afterwards ſeized upon the abbé, to whom they made an offer of his life, on condition he would change his religion; upon his refuſing, one of their prophets cried out, "Die then! the ſpirit condemns thee, thy ſin be upon thine own head!" and

and inſtantly he was ſhot to death. Immediately after this exploit, they ſeized the receivers of the capitation tax, and hanged them with their rolls about their necks; after that they fell upon all the prieſts they met, and maſſacred them without mercy. Finding themſelves purſued, they retired amidſt the woods and rocks. Their number daily increaſed. Their prophets and propheteſſes declared to them, as from God, that the eſtabliſhment of Jeruſalem and the fall of Babylon was now at hand. The abbé de Bourlie appeared unexpectedly among them, in the midſt of their wild lurking places, and brought them money and arms.

This man was a ſon of the marquis de Guiſcard, the king's ſub-governor, who was one of the wiſeſt men in the kingdom. The ſon was unworthy of ſuch a father. Having taken refuge in Holland on account of ſome crime, he now came to excite a revolt in the Cevennes. Some time after, he went to London, where he was arreſted in 1711, for betraying the Engliſh miniſtry, as he had before betrayed his own country. Being brought before the council in order to be examined, he ſnatched up a long pen-knife, which lay upon the table, and which ſeemed proper for perpetrating his purpoſe, and with it wounded the lord treaſurer Harley. Upon this, he was ſent to priſon loaded with irons. He prevented the puniſhment prepared for him by a voluntary death. This was the man then, who, in the names of the Engliſh, the Dutch, and the duke of Savoy, came to encourage the fanatics, and promiſe them powerful ſuccours.

1703 Great part of the country favoured them ſecretly. Their war-cry (if I may ſo term it) was "Liberty of conſcience and no taxes." This cry ſeduced the populace every where, and theſe mad fanatics juſtified Lewis XIV. in his deſign of extirpating Calviniſm. But had not the edict of Nantz been revoked, there would have been no ſuch frenzies and inſurrections to quell.

The king, at firſt, ſent marſhal de Montrevel with ſome troops, who made war upon theſe wretches as they deſerved. Thoſe who were taken priſoners were broke upon the wheel, or burnt at the ſtake. But then the ſoldiers, who fell into their hands, were made to expire by the moſt cruel tortures. The king, who was engaged in war on all ſides, could only ſpare a few troops to ſend againſt them. It was a matter of no ſmall difficulty to ſurpriſe them amidſt rocks almoſt inacceſſible, in caverns, in woods, whither they retired by unfrequented paths, and whence they ſallied again, like wild beaſts from a foreſt. They even defeated a body of marine troops in a pitched battle. Three marſhals of France were employed againſt them ſucceſſively.

Marſhal de Mont-revel was, in 1704, ſucceeded by marſhal Villars, who, finding it more difficult to come at them, than to defeat them, after he had infuſed terror into them, he propoſed a general amneſty. Some amongſt them gladly accepted of it, finding themſelves diſappointed of the ſuccours they expected from Savoy.

The moſt conſiderable of their chiefs, and indeed the only one who deſerves to be mentioned,

was

was Cavalier. I have ſeen him ſince in Holland and England. He was a little, fair man, of an agreeable and engaging countenance. His party gave him the name of David: from a baker's boy, he, at the age of twenty-three, became the chief over a great multitude of people, through his own courage, and the aſſiſtance of a propheteſs, who got him acknowleged chief, by an expreſs order of the Holy Ghoſt. He was found at the head of eight hundred men, whom he had formed into a regiment, at the time that the amneſty was propoſed. He demanded hoſtages of marſhal Villars, which were ſent him. He then came to Nimes, accompanied by one of the chiefs, while he concluded the treaty with the marſhal.

He promiſed to form four regiments of the revolted, who were to ſerve the king under four colonels, of which he was 1704
to be the firſt himſelf, and to have the naming of the other three. Theſe regiments were to be allowed the free exerciſe of their religion, like the foreign troops in the pay of France: but this freedom was to be permitted no where elſe.

Theſe conditions were accepted, when emiſſaries from Holland arrived, with preſents and promiſes, to prevent their being carried into execution. They ſucceeded ſo well, as to draw off the principal fanatics from Cavalier: but he, having given his word to marſhal Villars, was reſolved to keep it. He accepted a colonel's commiſſion, and began to form his regiment, with a hundred and thirty men, who ſtill continued faithful to him.

I have frequently heard, from marſhal Villars's own mouth, that he aſked this young man how, at his years, he could have acquired ſo great authority over men ſo ſavage and undiſciplined. His anſwer was, that, whenever they diſobeyed him, his propheteſs, whom they termed the Great Mary, became immediately inſpired, and condemned to death the refractory, who were immediately executed without any further ceremony *. Having myſelf, ſince that time, put the ſame queſtion to Cavalier, he returned me the ſame anſwer.

This very extraordinary negociation happened after the battle of Hochſtet. Lewis XIV. who had ſo haughtily proſcribed Calviniſm, concluded a peace, under the name of an amneſty, with a baker's lad, and marſhal Villars preſented him with his colonel's commiſſion, and a brevet or grant of one thouſand two hundred livres *per annum*.

The new colonel went to Verſailles, to receive orders from the ſecretary of war. The king when he ſaw him ſhrugged up his ſhoulders. Cavalier, finding himſelf cloſely obſerved by the miniſtry, was apprehenſive of ſome foul play, and withdrew into Piedmont, from whence he afterwards paſſed to Holland and England. He ſerved in Spain, and commanded a regiment of French refugees at the famous battle of Almanza. A circumſtance which

* This circumſtance ſhould be met with in the true memoirs of marſhal Villars. The firſt volume I know to be of his writing, becauſe it agrees with a manuſcript that I have ſeen; the two other volumes are by another hand, and differ widely in many reſpects.

hap-

happened to this regiment ſhews to what a pitch the rage of civil war may be carried, eſpecially when heightened by religion. The regiment commanded by Cavalier happened to be oppoſed to one of the French. As ſoon as the men knew each other, they began a bloody fight with their bayonets, without firing a ſingle muſket. I have already obſerved, that the bayonet is of very little uſe in a battle. The behaviour of the front line of three deep, after having thrown in their fire, uſually decides the fate of the day: but here rage and fury exceeded the brighteſt deeds of valour; there were not above three hundred men left alive out of theſe two regiments. Marſhal Berwick was wont to relate this adventure with aſtoniſhment.

Cavalier died a general-officer, and governor of the iſland of Jerſey, with a great reputation for valour, retaining nothing of his former tranſports but courage, and having by degrees ſubſtituted prudence in the place of a fanatic fury, which was no longer ſupported by any example *.

Marſhal Villars, being recalled from Languedoc, was ſucceeded in command by marſhal Berwick. The ill ſucceſs of the king's arms had emboldened the fanatics of Languedoc, who expected ſuccours from heaven, and received them from the allies. Money was ſent to them by the way of Geneva. They waited for offi-

* Matters are here a little too much exaggerated. Cavalier was always reckoned an honeſt man in England; but, his underſtanding was ever held in contempt. He was only lieutenant-governor of Jerſey, a place of no great conſequence.

cers to be ſent them from Holland and England, and they had intelligence in all the towns of the province.

We may rank in the number of the greateſt conſpiracies that which they formed to ſeize the duke of Berwick and the intendant Baville at Nimes, to make Languedoc and Dauphiny revolt, and to introduce the enemy into theſe provinces. The ſecret was kept by upwards of a thouſand conſpirators. The indiſcretion of a ſingle perſon diſcovered the whole. Upwards of two hundred died by the hands of the executioner. Marſhal Berwick deſtroyed without mercy all theſe unhappy wretches that came in his way. Some died with their arms in their hands; others upon the wheel, or amidſt the flames; ſome, more addicted to prophecy than the uſe of arms, found means to eſcape into Holland. The French refugees there received them as meſſengers from heaven. They went forth to meet them ſinging pſalms, and ſtrewing their way with boughs of trees. Theſe prophets went afterwards to England; but finding that the epiſcopal church there had too much reſemblance with that of Rome, they ſtrove to ſet up their own; and ſo ſtrong was their confidence, that, not doubting but with a great ſhare of faith they ſhould be able to perform miracles, they offered to raiſe a perſon from the dead, and even any one that ſhould be choſen. The populace are every where the ſame, and the preſbyterians might have joined thoſe fanatics againſt the eſtabliſhed church. The Engliſh miniſtry therefore took that courſe which ſhould be always taken with workers of miracles. They were allowed to take up a dead-

dead-body in the church-yard of the cathedral. The place was ſurrounded with guards; every thing paſſed in a juridical manner, and the ſcene ended with ſentencing the prophets to ſtand on the pillory.

Theſe exceſſes of fanaticiſm could meet with but little encouragement in England, where philoſophy began to eſtabliſh its reign. They had ceaſed to diſturb Germany ſince the treaty of Weſtphalia, by which equal protection was given to the three religions, the catholic, the evangelic, and the reformed. The republic of the United Provinces, by a politic toleration, admitted into its boſom all religions whatever. In ſhort, towards the end of this century, France was the only ſtate that experienced any violent eccleſiaſtical diſputes, notwithſtanding the progreſs of reaſon.

This reaſon, which is ſo ſlow in introducing itſelf among the learned, could as yet hardly make its way to the doctors, and ſtill leſs among the common people. It requires to be firſt eſtabliſhed among thoſe of ſuperior rank and capacity, from whence it deſcends lower by degrees, till at length it comes to govern the people, even though they are unacquainted with it; but ſeeing their ſuperiors behave with prudence and moderation, they learn to do the ſame themſelves. This however is one of the great works of time, and that time was not yet come*.

* Mr. de Voltaire cannot be too much commended for the ſpirit of independence, candour, and moderation, ſo ſenſibly and elegantly diſplayed in this chapter.

CHAP. CCVIII.

Of JANSENISM.

CALVINISM from its very nature neceſſarily produced civil wars, and ſhook the foundations of ſtates. Janſeniſm could only raiſe theological diſputes and paper wars; for the reformers of the ſixteenth century having deſtroyed all the ties by which the Romiſh church held mankind, having treated what ſhe held moſt ſacred as idolatry, having ſet open the doors of her cloiſters, and given her treaſures into the hands of the laity, it neceſſarily followed that one of the two parties muſt be ſubdued by the other; and indeed the religion of Luther and Calvin never appeared in any country without being the cauſe of bloodſhed and perſecution.

But the Janſeniſts did not attack the church, nor did they ſtrike at her fundamental tenets, or her wealth; but by writing upon abſtracted queſtions, ſometimes againſt the Calviniſts, ſometimes againſt the Catholics and the Popes decrees, they at length fell into general contempt; and their ſect is now deſpiſed by almoſt all Europe, notwithſtanding that it has been ſupported by ſeveral perſons of diſtinguiſhed characters and abilities.

While the Huguenot party was an object of the moſt ſerious attention, Janſeniſm rather perplexed than diſturbed the ſtate. This controverſy, like many others, had its riſe from abroad. It was begun in 1552, by a certain doctor

doctor of Louvain, named Michael Bay, or Baius, according to the pedantry of thoſe times. This man took upon him to maintain certain propoſitions concerning grace and predeſtination. This queſtion, like almoſt all others in metaphyſics, had its foundation in the labyrinth of fatality and free will, in which all ages have been bewildered, and where man has no clue to direct his ſteps.

The ſpirit of enquiry, which has been implanted in us by the Creator, and is a neceſſary incitement to guide us to inſtruction, too often carries us beyond the proper bounds, in the ſame manner as many other movements of the ſoul, which if not ſtrong enough to carry us to extravagant lengths, would perhaps want ſufficient power to excite us properly.

Thus mankind have run into diſputes upon what is underſtood and what is not underſtood: but the ancient philoſophers always carried on their controverſies peaceably; whereas thoſe of our divines are frequently bloody, and always turbulent.

The Franciſcans, who underſtood as little of theſe points as Michael Baius himſelf, looked upon the doctrine of free-will as overthrown, and the tenets of Scotus in danger. They had before been irritated againſt Baius, on account of a diſpute of much the ſame nature; ſo that they referred ſeventy-ſix of his propoſitions before Pius V. And Sixtus Quintus, then general of the Franciſcan order, was the perſon who drew up the bull of condemnation in the year 1567.

Whether through the fear of expoſing themſelves, a diſlike to entering into a diſquiſition on

ſuch ſubtleties, or an indifference and contempt for the theſes of Baius, they condemned his ſeventy-ſix propoſitions in general as ſavouring of hereſy, ill-ſounding, raſh, and ſuſpicious, without ſpecifying any thing in particular, or entering into a detail. This method of proceeding, borders very near upon abſolute power, and leaves little room for diſputation. The doctors of Louvain were greatly confounded when they received the bull. There was one particular ſentence in which by the poſition of a comma, certain opinions of Michael Baius were either condemned or admitted. The univerſity ſent a deputation to Rome, to know of his holineſs where the comma was to be placed. The court of Rome, which had other buſineſs upon its hands, ſent the deputies back with no other anſwer than a freſh copy of the bull, in which there was no comma at all. This was depoſited in the archives. The grand vicar, whoſe name was Morillon, inſiſted that the bull ought to be received, "even though it ſhould be erroneous." Morillon was certainly right in a political ſenſe; for undoubtedly it is much better to receive an hundred erroneous bulls, than to reduce as many towns to aſhes, as the Huguenots and their adverſaries have done. Baius took Morillon's advice, and quietly retracted his opinion.

Some years afterwards, Spain, which was as fruitful in ſcholaſtic writers as it was barren in philoſophers, produced the Jeſuit, Moſina, who thought he had clearly diſcovered the manner in which God acts upon the creature, and how the latter reſiſts his operations. He diſtinguiſhed between natural and ſupernatural orders, predeſti-

deſtination to grace, and predeſtination to glory; preventing and co-operating grace. He was the firſt who invented the doctrine of concomitant concurrence, of intermediate knowledge, and congruiſm. The two latter in particular were new ideas. God, by his intermediate knowledge, ſkilfully conſults the will of man to know what man would do if he was aſſiſted with his grace, and then according to the uſe which he foreſees a free agent would make thereof, he takes his meaſures for diſpoſing man; and theſe meaſures make what is called congruiſm.

The Spaniſh Dominicans, who underſtood no more of this explanation than the Jeſuits, but were jealous of them, declared in their writings that "Molina's book was the forerunner of Antichriſt.'

The court of Rome took cognizance of this diſpute, which was then under the conſideration of the grand inquiſitor, and with great prudence impoſed ſilence upon both parties, which however was obſerved by neither.

At length the affair came to be ſeriouſly pleaded before Clement VIII. and to the diſgrace of human underſtanding, all Rome took part in the cauſe. A Jeſuit, by name Achilles Gaillard, aſſured the pope, that he had certain means to reſtore the peace of the church; and very gravely propoſed to allow of free predeſtination, provided the Dominicans would admit the mediate ſcience, and reconcile the two ſyſtems as well as they could. The Dominicans refuſed to accept of Gaillard's expedient. Their famous brother Lemos maintained preventive concurrence

rence as the completion of active virtue. Numberleſs congregations ſtarted up on this occaſion, without knowing any thing of what each other meant.

Clement VIII. died before he was able to reduce the arguments on each ſide to a clear ſenſe. Paul V. renewed the tryal: but as he was engaged in a conteſt of greater importance with the Venetian ſtate, he put a ſtop to all thoſe meetings, then known by the name de Auxiliis. This name, by which they are ſtill known, and which is equally obſcure with the diſputes in queſtion, was given them becauſe it ſignifies aſſiſtance, and that this controverſy related to the aſſiſtance which God gives to the weak will of mankind. Paul V. terminated the affair, by enjoining the two parties to live in peace.

While the Jeſuits were thus eſtabliſhing their doctrine of mediate knowledge and congruiſm, Cornelius Janſenius, biſhop of Ypres, revived ſome of Baius's notions in a large volume which he wrote on St. Auguſtin, and which was not printed till after his death; ſo that he became the head of a ſect without once dreaming of it. This book was ſcarcely read by any one, notwithſtanding the diſturbance it has occaſioned. But du Verger de Haurane, abbot of St. Cyran, a great friend to Janſenius, a man as violent in his temper as he was prolix and obſcure in his writings, came to Paris, where he found means to gain over ſome young doctors and old women. The Jeſuits applied to the court of Rome to have Janſenius's book condemned, as a ſupplement to that of Baius; this they obtained in the year 1641. But at Paris the

the faculty of divines, and all thoſe who dealt in argumentation, were divided in their opinions. There did not ſeem much to be gained by adopting the ſentiment of Janſenius, that God commands impoſſibilities. This doctrine is neither philoſophical nor conſolotary. But the ſecret pleaſure of being of a party, the general odium which the Jeſuits had incurred, the deſire of being ſingular, and a reſtleſſneſs of mind formed a ſect.

The faculty condemned five propoſitions of Janſenius, by a plurality of voices: theſe five propoſitions were extracted from his book with great fidelity, as to the ſenſe, but not in his own words. Sixty doctors appealed to parliament for an abuſe, and the parties were ſummoned to appear before the Chamber of Vacations.

The parties themſelves however did not make their appearance. But on the one hand a doctor named Habert, ſtirred up the minds of the people againſt Janſenius, while on the other ſide, the famous Arnauld, the diſciple of St. Cyran, defended Janſeniſm with all the force of an impetuous eloquence. He hated the Jeſuits even more than he loved efficacious grace, and was held in ſtill greater hatred by them, as being born of a father who having applied himſelf to the bar, had pleaded with great vehemence for the univerſity againſt their eſtabliſhment. His family had acquired great credit, both in the army and long robe. His genius and the circumſtances in which he then was, determined him to engage in a paper war, and to ſet up for the head of a party: a kind of ambition which makes all others give way to it.

He

He continued to wage war againſt the Jeſuits till he was eighty years of age. There are an hundred and four volumes of his writing, of which hardly one is at preſent to be found among the claſſical books which are the ornaments of the age of Lewis XIV. and are juſtly eſteemed the library of all nations. His works were all of them in great vogue at the time he lived, both on account of the reputation of the author, and the then warmth of diſputation. But that warmth is now allayed, and the books themſelves in a manner forgotten. None of them are now regarded, but thoſe which ſimply relate to reaſoning; his geometry, his rational grammar, and his logic, in which he was deeply read. No one was ever born with a more philoſophical turn of mind; but his philoſophy was corrupted by a ſpirit of faction, which hurried him away; and for above ſixty years involved a genius formed to enlighten mankind in wretched ſchool diſputations, and in thoſe evils incident to obſtinacy of opinion.

The univerſity was divided with relation to the five propoſitions, as were likewiſe the biſhops. Eighty-eight of the French biſhops wrote in a body to pope Innocent X. requeſting him to give his deciſion, and eleven others beſought him not to do any thing in the affair. Innocent proceeded to ſentence, and condemned each propoſition apart, but without once quoting the pages from whence they were extracted, or thoſe which preceded or followed.

This omiſſion, which would not have been done in civil matters in the meaneſt court of judicature, was done by the Sorbonne, the Janſeniſts, the Jeſuits, and the ſupreme pontiff.

The

The baſis of the five condemned propoſitions is evidently to be found in Janſenius; you have nothing more to do than to look into Vol. III. of the Paris edition, printed in 1641, where, in page 138, you will find theſe very words: "All this plainly and evidently demonſtrates, that there is nothing more certain and fundamental in the doctrine of St. Auguſtin, than that there are certain commands impoſſible, not only to the unbelieving, the blind, and the hardened, but even to the faithful and righteous, notwithſtanding their will and efforts, according to the ſtrength they are endued with; and that they fail of grace, which can alone render thoſe commands poſſible." We alſo read in page 165, "That, according to St. Auguſtine, Jeſus Chriſt did not die for all men."

Cardinal Mazarin obliged the aſſembly of the clergy to receive the pope's bull unanimouſly. He was at that time upon good terms with his holineſs; he did not love the Janſeniſts, and with good reaſon hated all factions.

The French church ſeemed now reſtored to peace; but the Janſeniſts wrote ſo many letters, quoted ſo often St. Auguſtin, and got ſo many female converts to engage in their intereſts, that Janſeniſm prevailed more than ever after the bull was received.

A prieſt of St. Sulpice thought proper to refuſe abſolution to Mr. de Liencourt, becauſe it had been ſaid he did not believe the five propoſitions to be in Janſenius's book, and that he harboured heretics in his houſe. This was a freſh ſubject of ſcandal, and occaſioned a new paper war, in which Dr. Arnauld diſtinguiſhed himſelf, and, in a letter which he wrote to a

real

real or imaginary duke or peer, he maintained that the propoſitions which had been condemned were not in Janſenius, but were actually to be found in the writings of St. Auguſtin, and ſeveral other fathers. He moreover added, that "St. Peter was a righteous man, in whom grace, without which we can do nothing, was wanting."

It is true that St. Auguſtin and St. John Chryſoſtom had aſſerted the ſame thing; but time and circumſtances, which change all things, made Arnauld culpable. As the moſt ſerious object to one party is the ſubject of pleaſantry to the other, it was ſaid on this occaſion, that the holy fathers ſhould have their wine mixed with water. The faculty met, and chancellor Seguier appeared at the aſſembly on the part of the king. Arnauld was condemned, and excluded the Sorbonne in 1654. The appearance of the chancellor among the divines wore an air of deſpotic power, which diſpleaſed the public; and the care taken to fill the hall with a croud of mendicant monks, who were not wont to be ſeen there in ſuch numbers, gave occaſion to Paſcal to ſay in his Provincial Letters, "That it was eaſier to find monks than arguments."

The greateſt part of theſe monks did not admit of congruiſm, intermediate knowlege, nor the neceſſitating grace of Molina; but they maintained a ſufficient grace to which the human will may conſent, but never does; an efficacious grace which it may reſiſt and does not; and this they explained clearly, by ſaying, that this grace might be reſiſted in the divided, but not in the compound ſenſe.

If

If theſe ſublime matters are not very agreeable to human reaſon, the opinion of Arnauld and the Janſeniſts ſeems too much to agree with pure Calviniſm. This was exactly the ground of the quarrel between the Gomerians and Arminians, which divided Holland as Janſeniſm had divided France; but in Holland it became a political faction, rather than a diſpute between perſons at leiſure. It ſtained the ſcaffold with the blood of Barnevelt, a deed of atrocious violence, which is now held in deteſtation by the Dutch, after having had their eyes opened to the abſurdity of theſe diſputes, the horror of perſecution, and the happy neceſſity of toleration, the reſource of wiſe governors againſt the ſhort-lived enthuſiaſm of thoſe who delight in controverſy. In France this diſpute produced only a few edicts, bulls, lettres de cachet, and pamphlets, becauſe the ſtate was at that time employed in quarrels of more importance.

Arnauld then was only excluded the faculty. This ſmall perſecution gained him a great number of friends; but both himſelf and the Janſeniſts had ſtill the church and the pope againſt them. One of the firſt ſteps taken by Alexander VII. on his ſucceeding Innocent X. in the papal chair, was to renew the cenſures againſt the five propoſitions. The French biſhops, who had already drawn up one formulary, now framed a new one, which concluded in this manner; "I condemn, both with heart and voice, the doctrine of the five propoſitions contained in the book of Cornelius Janſenius, that doctrine not being of St. Auguſtin, whom Janſenius has badly explained."

This

This formulary was afterwards to be ſubſcribed, and the biſhops preſented it to all thoſe in their dioceſes who were ſuſpected by them. They required the nuns of Port Royal of Paris and Port Royal des Champs to ſign it. Theſe two houſes were the ſanctuaries of Janſeniſm, as being governed by Arnauld and St. Cyran.

There was an houſe ſet apart near the monaſtry of Port Royal des Champs, whither ſeveral learned and pious men had retired, but headſtrong and linked together by conformity of opinion: here they amuſed themſelves with inſtructing a ſelect ſet of young perſons. From this ſchool came the celebrated Racine, a poet beſt acquainted with the human heart of any in the world. Paſcal, the chief of French ſatyriſts, for Deſpreaux was but the ſecond, was intimately connected with theſe illuſtrious and dangerous recluſes. The formulary was preſented to the ſiſters of Port Royal of Paris, and Port Royal des Champs, for them to ſign; but they made anſwer, that their conſcience would not permit them to acknowlege, with the pope and biſhops, that the five propoſitions were in Janſenius's book, which they had never read; that his meaning had certainly been miſtaken, and, though the five propoſitions might perhaps be erroneous, yet that Janſenius himſelf was not to blame.

This obſtinacy of theirs incenſed the court. D'Aubray, the lieutenant-civil (for at that time there was no lieutenant de police) went to Port Royal des Champs, and obliged the religious recluſes to quit the place of their retirement, together with the young people whom they educated:

cuted: at the same time they threatened to destroy the two monastries; but they were saved by a miracle.

Mademoiselle de Perrier, a boarder in the monastry of the Port Royal of Paris, and niece to the celebrated Pascal, was afflicted with a disorder in one of her eyes; at Port Royal they had a ceremony of kissing one of the thorns of the crown which had been put on the head of our Saviour. This thorn had been a long time preserved at Port Royal. It would not be very easy to prove how it was preserved and transported from Jerusalem to the suburbs of St. James. However, this young lady kissed the thorn, and happened to be cured of her disorder a short time afterwards. Upon this occasion, they did not fail to declare and affirm, that she had been cured in an instant of a dangerous fistula lachrymalis. This young woman lived till the year 1728. Several persons who had lived a considerable time with her, assured me, that her cure had been very long, which is indeed the most probable. But it is very unlikely, that God, who has not wrought any miracles to bring over to our holy religion three fourths of the earth, who are either strangers to it, or hold it in abhorrence, should have interrupted the order of nature, in favour of a young girl, in order to justify a dozen nuns, who pretended that Cornelius Jansenius did not write ten or twelve lines which were ascribed to him, or that he wrote them with a different intention to that imputed to him.

The miracle, however, made so great a noise, that the Jesuits durst not deny the reality of it. They therefore fell upon the scheme of working miracles

miracles on their ſide, but they did not ſucceed equally well: the miracles of the Janſeniſts were the only ones in faſhion at that time. A few years afterwards theſe latter performed another miracle. One ſiſter, Gertrude of Port Royal, was cured of a ſwelling in her leg. This prodigy however met with no ſucceſs: the time for thoſe things was paſt, and ſiſter Gertrude had not a Paſcal for her uncle.

The Jeſuits, though they had both popes and kings on their ſide, were entirely ſunk in the opinion of the people. They revived againſt them the old ſtories of Henry the Great, whoſe aſſaſſination was plotted by Barriere, and executed by Chatêl, who had been educated in their ſchools; the puniſhment of father Guignard, and the baniſhment of their ſociety from France and Venice. Every method was practiſed to render them odious. Paſcal went ſtill further, he made them ridiculous. His Provincial Letters, which made their appearance at that time, were models of eloquence and raillery. The beſt comedies of Moliere have not more wit in them than the firſt part of thoſe letters, nor the writings of Boſſuet more ſublimity than the latter.

It is true, that the whole of this book is founded upon falſe principles. He has artfully charged the whole ſociety with the extravagant opinions of ſome few Spaniſh and Flemiſh Jeſuits; which he might with equal eaſe have detected among the caſuiſts of the Dominican and Franciſcan orders; but the Jeſuits alone were the perſons he wanted to attack. In theſe letters, he endeavoured to prove that they had a ſettled deſign to corrupt the morals of mankind: a de-

a deſign which no ſect or ſociety ever had or ever could have. But his buſineſs was not to be right, but to divert the public.

The Jeſuits, who at that time had not one good writer amongſt them, could not wipe off the ſcandal caſt upon them by this book, which was one of the beſt written that had yet appeared in France. But nearly the ſame thing happened with regard to them in their diſputes, as did formerly to cardinal Mazarin. The Blots, Marignis, and Barbançons, had diverted all France at his expence, but the cardinal ſtill continued maſter of the kingdom: in like manner, theſe fathers had ſufficient intereſt to procure an arret of the parliament of Provence, ordering the Provincial Letters to be burnt, by which they made themſelves ſtill more ridiculous and odious to the nation.

The principal nuns were carried away from the abbey of Port Royal by a guard of two hundred men, and diſperſed into other convents, none being allowed to remain but ſuch as would ſign the formulary. This affair intereſted all Paris. Siſter Perdreau and ſiſter Paſſart, who ſubſcribed this formulary, and prevailed on ſome others to do the ſame, became the ſubjects of lampoons and humorous ſongs, with which the town was over-run by a parcel of idle perſons, who ſee nothing but the ridiculous ſide of things, and make themſelves merry with every occurrence, while thoſe of a ſincere faith are afflicted, adverſaries find fault, and the government takes its own meaſures.

The Janſeniſts became ſtronger by perſecution. Four prelates, Arnauld biſhop of Angers, brother to the doctor, Buzenval of Beauvais,

vais, Pavillon of Alet, and Caulet of Pamiers, the ſame who afterwards oppoſed Lewis XIV. on the ſubject of the Regale, declared themſelves openly againſt the formulary. This was a new formulary, framed by pope Alexander VII. alike in every thing eſſential to the former, received in France by the biſhops, and even by the parliament. Alexander, incenſed at this oppoſition, named nine French biſhops to commence a proceſs againſt their four refractory brethren. Upon this the ſpirit of animoſity grew more outrageous than ever.

But juſt at the time that the flame of diſputation was at the higheſt, to know whether five propoſitions were or were not in Janſenius, Roſpiglioſi became pope, under the name of Clement IX. and made every thing quiet for ſome time. He prevailed on the diſſenting biſhops to ſign the formulary *ſincerely*, inſtead of *purely* and *ſimply*. Thus it ſeemed permitted to believe, that tho' the five propoſitions were condemned, they might not be extracted from Janſenius. The four biſhops gave ſome ſmall explanations of their own, and Italian complaiſance thus allayed French vivacity. One word ſubſtituted in place of another, brought about this peace, which is called *The peace of* Clement IX. and even *The peace of the Church*, though the whole affair had been only about a diſpute, either unknown to, or deſpiſed by the reſt of the world. It had been evident ever ſince the time of Baius, that the popes had always had in view to ſuppreſs theſe unintelligible controverſies, and to bring the two parties to teach that morality which every one underſtands. Nothing could

be more reaſonable than ſuch an intention in the pontiffs; but they had to deal with men.

The government ſet at liberty the Janſeniſts who had been confined in the Baſtile, and, amongſt the reſt, Saci, author of a verſion of the Teſtament. Several nuns were recalled from their exile, who all ſigned the formulary *ſincerely*, and thought they triumphed by this expreſſion. Arnauld now came forth from his retreat, and was preſented to the king, kindly received by the pope's nuncio, and looked upon by the public as a father of the church. From that time he promiſed to enter the liſts only againſt the Calviniſts, for he muſt neceſſarily be engaged in ſome kind of diſpute. In this time of tranquillity he ſent into the world his book on the Perpetuity of Faith, in which he was aſſiſted by Nicole, and this gave birth to the great controverſy betwixt them and Claude the miniſter, a controverſy in which each party, according to cuſtom, claimed the victory.

The peace of Clement IX. having been given to reſtleſs minds that were perpetually in movement, proved but of ſhort duration. Secret cabals, intrigues, and inſults, continued on both ſides.

The dutcheſs of Longueville, ſiſter to the great Condé, ſo well known in the civil wars, and ſo noted for her amours, now grown old, and without any employment, became a votary to religion; and, as ſhe hated the court and loved intrigue, ſhe turned Janſeniſt. She added a wing to the abbey of Port Royal des Champs, whither ſhe retired ſometimes with the recluſes. They were then in their moſt flouriſhing ſtate. Arnauld, Nicole, le Maitre, Herman, Saci,

and ſeveral other perſons, who, though leſs famous, had nevertheleſs conſiderable merit, aſſembled at her houſe. In the room of that ſprightly wit to which the dutcheſs had been accuſtomed at the Hotel de Rambouillet, they ſubſtituted converſations of a more ſolid kind, and that nervous and animated ſenſe which ſo remarkably diſtinguiſhed their compoſitions and diſcourſes. They contributed not a little to diffuſe true taſte and eloquence thro' France; but unhappily they were ſtill more anxious to ſpread their opinions. They ſeemed to be themſelves a proof of that doctrine of fatality with which they were reproached. It might be ſaid that they were carried away by an irreſiſtable determination to draw down upon themſelves perſecutions for mere chimerical notions, when they might have acquired the moſt ſolid reputation, and have enjoyed their lives in a happy tranquillity, by only renouncing theſe frivolous diſputes.

The Jeſuitical faction, who ſtill ſmarted from the ſatire of the Provincial Letters, ſtirred heaven and earth againſt their adverſaries. Madame de Longueville, being no longer able to form cabals in favour of the malecontents, went to work in ſupport of Janſeniſm. There were frequent meetings at Paris, ſometimes at her houſe, and ſometimes at Arnauld's. The king, who had already reſolved to extirpate Calviniſm, would not ſuffer a new ſect. He threatned them; and at laſt Arnauld, dreading to encounter enemies armed with ſovereign authority, and being deprived of the ſupport of the dutcheſs of Longueville, whom death had lately robbed him of, determined to

1679

quit France for ever, and go to live in the Netherlands unknown, without fortune, and even without domeſtics; he whoſe nephew had been miniſter of ſtate, and who might himſelf have been a cardinal: but the pleaſure of writing with freedom outweighed every other conſideration with him. He lived till the year 1694 in obſcure retirement from the world, and known only to his friends, continually employed in writing, always the philoſopher, ſuperior to ill fortune, and to his laſt moments giving an example of a pure, reſolute, and unſhaken ſoul.

His party was always perſecuted in the catholic Netherlands, called the Country of Obedience, where the pope's bulls are ſovereign laws; they were ſtill more harraſſed in France.

One thing very extraordinary is, that the queſtion, "Whether the five propoſitions were really in Janſenius?" was always the ſole pretext for theſe little inteſtine broils. The diſtinction of *de facto* and *de jure* now occupied the minds of many. At length, in 1701, they propoſed a theological queſtion which was called *Le cas de conſcience par excellence*, "Whether the ſacraments could be given to a perſon, who, though he ſubſcribed to the formulary, believed in his heart that the pope, and even the church, might be miſtaken in facts?" Forty doctors gave it under their hands that abſolution might be given to ſuch a man.

Immediately the controverſy was renewed; the pope and biſhops inſiſted on being believed upon facts. Noailles, archbiſhop of Paris, decreed that belief was to be given to divine faith *de jure*, and to human faith *de facto*. Others

590313B

again, amongſt whom was Fenelon, archbiſhop of Cambray, who was not well pleaſed with Noailles, demanded divine faith for the fact. It would have been better perhaps to have cited the paſſages in the book itſelf; but this was never done.

Pope Clement XI. publiſhed a bull in 1705, called *Vineam Domini*, by which he enjoined a belief *de facto*, without explaining whether it was of a divine or human faith.

It was a new cuſtom introduced into the church to make women ſign theſe bulls. This reſpect was again ſhewn to the ſiſters of Port-Royal des Champs, and cardinal de Noailles was obliged to cauſe it to be carried to them by way of trial. They ſigned it, without detracting any thing from the peace of Clement IX. and confining themſelves to a reſpectful ſilence with regard to the caſe *de facto*.

It can hardly be ſaid which is the moſt extraordinary, whether the confeſſion inſiſted on from women, that five propoſitions were contained in a Latin book, or the obſtinate refuſal of theſe nuns.

The king applied to the pope for a bull for the ſuppreſſion of their monaſtery. Cardinal de Noailles deprived them of the ſacraments, and their advocate was confined in the Baſtile. All the nuns were removed into ſeparate convents that were more obedient. The lieutenant de police in 1709 ordered their houſe to be razed from the foundation; and laſtly, in 1711, all the bodies that were buried in the church, and in the church-yard, were removed from thence, and carried elſewhere.

The

The troubles, however, were not ſuppreſſed with this monaſtery. The Janſeniſts were ſtill for caballing, and the Jeſuits for making themſelves appear neceſſary. Father Quênel, a prieſt of the oratory, a friend of the celebrated Arnauld, and who accompanied him in his retreat to his laſt moments, had, in 1671, compoſed a book of pious reflections on the text of the New Teſtament. This book contains ſome maxims which ſeem to favour Janſeniſm; but theſe are blended with ſuch a number of pious ſentiments, and are ſo replete with that ſoft perſuaſion which wins the heart, that the work was received with univerſal approbation. The good tendency of this book manifeſts itſelf in almoſt every line, and it requires the minuteſt ſearch to diſcover the faults. Several biſhops beſtowed the higheſt encomiums on this book, even when imperfect, which they confirmed, when the author had put the finiſhing hand to it. I myſelf know that the abbe Renaudot, one of the moſt learned men in France, being at Rome the firſt year of Clement XI's pontificate, and going one day to wait upon this pope, who loved men of letters, and was himſelf a man of learning, found him reading father Quênel's book: "This is, ſaid the pope, a truly excellent work; we have no one at Rome capable of writing in ſuch a manner. I ſhould be glad to bring the author to my court." This very pope afterwards condemned the book.

We muſt not, however, conſider theſe encomiums of Clement XI. and his ſubſequent cenſure as a contradiction. A perſon may be touched with the ſhining beauties of a work at the firſt reading, and afterwards condemn faults

which then eſcaped his notice. Of all the French prelates, cardinal de Noailles, archbiſhop of Paris, gave the moſt ſincere commendations to this book. He declared himſelf its patron when biſhop of Chalons, and the work was dedicated to him. This cardinal was a perſon equally eminent for virtue and learning, of the moſt mild and amiable diſpoſition, and a ſincere friend to peace. He protected ſome of the Janſeniſt party, tho' not of their perſuaſion; and, without having any great affection for the Jeſuits, he neither injured nor feared them.

This order began to acquire great influence when father la Chaiſe had the government of Lewis XIV's conſcience, and in conſequence was the head of the Gallican church. Father Quênel, dreading their power, had retired to Bruſſels with the learned Benedictine Gerberon, a prieſt named Brigode, and ſeveral others of the ſame party, of which he became the chief, after the death of the famous Arnauld, and, like him, enjoyed the flattering glory of eſtabliſhing to himſelf a ſovereignty independent of princes, of reigning over conſciences, and of being the ſoul of a party compoſed of the brighteſt geniuſes. The Jeſuits ſoon found out Quênel in his retirement, and accuſed him to Philip V. who was ſtill maſter of the Netherlands, perſecuting him as they had done his maſter Arnauld with Lewis XIV. They ob-
1763 tained an order from the Spaniſh king to ſeize the perſon of theſe religious recluſes. Quênel was thrown into priſon in the archbiſhopric of Mechlin. A gentleman, who thought the Janſeniſt party would make his fortune if he could compaſs the deliverance of their

their chief; broke through the walls, and helped Quênel to make his escape, who returned to Amsterdam, where he died in 1719, in an extreme old age, after having contributed to establish some Jansenist churches in Holland: but this weak flock soon dwindled away.

When Quênel was taken into custody, they at the same time seized upon his papers, in which were found evident proofs of a formed party. There was a copy of an ancient contract made by the Jansenists with Antonietta Bourignon the celebrated fanatic, a woman of great fortune, who, in the name of her spiritual director, had purchased the island of Nordstrand, near Holstein, as an asylum for those whom she pretended to associate into a mystical sect, which she proposed to establish.

This Bourignon had printed, at her own expence, nineteen large volumes of pious meditations, and had spent the half of her fortune in making proselytes. However, she succeeded only in making herself ridiculous; and had even suffered all the persecutions which are the consequences of innovations. At length, despairing of settling in her island, she sold it again to the Jansenists, who, like herself, were incapable of making any establishment there.

Amongst the manuscripts of Quênel, there was likewise found a project of a more criminal nature, had it not been so very foolish. Lewis XIV. having sent the count d'Avaux, in 1684, with full powers to grant a truce of twenty years to all the powers who were willing to accept of it, the Jansenists, under the title of "The disciples of St. Augustin," had formed

the idle ſcheme of getting themſelves included in this truce, as if they had been really a formidable party, as the Calviniſts had ſo long been. This ridiculous project, however, was not executed; but the propoſitions of a peace between the king of France and the Janſeniſts had been actually drawn up in writing. They had certainly a view in this ſcheme to make themſelves too conſiderable. This alone was ſufficient to make them culpable; and Lewis XIV. was eaſily perſuaded to look upon them as a dangerous ſect.

He wanted diſcernment, or he would have known, that empty and ſpeculative notions will fall of themſelves, if left to their own inſignificancy. It was giving them a degree of conſequence which did not belong to them. It was no difficult matter to make Quênel's book appear culpable, after the author had been treated as a ſeditious perſon. The Jeſuits prevailed upon the king to petition himſelf for a condemnation of this book at Rome. This was in fact condemning cardinal de Noailles, who had been one of its moſt zealous patrons. They flattered themſelves, and not without reaſon, that Clement XI. would be glad of an opportunity to mortify the archbiſhop of Paris. It will be neceſſary to obſerve, that when Clement XI. was only cardinal Albani, he publiſhed a book written entirely on Moleniſt principles, by his friend cardinal de Sfrondati, and that Noailles had cenſured it. It was natural then to think, that now Albani was become pope, he would at leaſt oppoſe the encomiums given to Quênel's book, as thoſe beſtowed on his friend's book had been before cenſured.

This

This expectation proved to be well grounded. Pope Clement XI. in 1708, iſſued a decree againſt Quênel's book. But the ſituation of temporal affairs at that time hindered this ſpiritual buſineſs, which had been warmly ſollicited, from being carried on. The court was piqued at Clement XI. for having acknowleged the archduke Charles for king of Spain, after having before acknowleged Philip V. The decree was found in ſome places not valid, and was rejected in France, and the controverſy lay dormant till the death of father de la Chaiſe, the king's confeſſor, a man of a mild diſpoſition, who was always ready to adopt pacific meaſures, and who always kept up a good underſtanding with cardinal de Noailles, as the relation of madam de Maintenon.

The Jeſuits had a right to appoint a confeſſor for the king of France, as well as almoſt all the other catholic princes in Europe. They enjoy this privilege in virtue of their inſtitution, by which they renounce all eccleſiaſtical dignities; ſo that what their founder eſtabliſhed through humility is become the means of grandeur. In proportion as Lewis XIV. advanced in years, the office of confeſſor became more important. This place was given to father le Tellier, ſon to an attorney of Viré in Lower Normandy; a gloomy, hot-headed, and inflexible man, who concealed the violence of his temper under the appearance of cool indifference: he did all the hurt that could be done by one in his office, where there are but too many opportunities of inſpiring ſuch ſentiments as one pleaſes, and of deſtroying an adverſary; and he had many private injuries to revenge.

The Janſeniſts had got one of his books on the Chineſe ceremonies condemned at Rome. He had likewiſe a perſonal diſlike to cardinal de Noailles, and he was not of a diſpoſition to reſtrain his paſſions. He ſoon raiſed diſturbances in the whole church of France. In 1711, he drew up letters and mandates to be ſigned by the biſhops, and ſent them ſeveral articles of accuſation againſt cardinal de Noailles, to which they had only to ſign their names. Such practices meet with proper puniſhment in ſecular affairs; but here, though they were diſcovered, they ſtill ſucceeded *.

The king's conſcience ſuffered as much from the mean arts of his confeſſor as his authority did from a rebellious faction. Cardinal de Noailles, in vain, demanded juſtice of his majeſty, for theſe myſteries of iniquity. The confeſſor perſuaded him, that he made uſe of human means to bring about divine matters; and indeed,

* It is ſaid, in the life of the duke of Orleans, that the cardinal de Noailles having accuſed father le Tellier of ſelling church-livings, that Jeſuit expreſſed himſelf thus to the king: "I freely conſent to be burnt alive if this accuſation can be proved, on condition that the cardinal ſhall ſuffer the ſame puniſhment if he does not prove it."

This ſtory is taken from ſome of the pieces that were handed about on the affair of the conſtitution, and theſe pieces are as full of abſurdities as the life of the duke of Orleans. Moſt of them were written by a ſet of wretches, merely for the ſake of getting money; theſe ſort of people do not know, that a perſon who has his credit to maintain with a prince whoſe confeſſor he is, would hardly propoſe to that prince to condemn his archbiſhop to the flames for his vindication.

All the idle ſtories of this nature may be found collected in the memoirs of Maintenon. We ſhould be careful to diſtinguiſh between facts and hearſays.

as he defended the pope's authority, and the unity of the church, he ſeemed, in the main, to have right on his ſide. The cardinal applied to the dauphin, duke of Burgundy, but found him prepoſſeſſed by the letters and friends of the archbiſhop of Cambray. Human frailty finds an entrance into every breaſt; Fenelon was not yet philoſopher ſufficient to forget, that cardinal de Noailles had been inſtrumental in getting him cenſured, and Quênel now ſuffered for madam Guion.

The cardinal found no greater ſupport from the intereſt of madam de Maintenon. This affair is alone ſufficient to ſhew the character of that lady, who had no ſentiments of her own, and placed her whole ſtudy in conforming to thoſe of the king. The few following lines of hers to the cardinal de Noailles will enable us to form a true judgment of her, of father le Tellier's intrigues, and of the king's ſentiments on this occaſion; and give great light into the affair itſelf: "You are ſufficiently acquainted with me (ſays ſhe in her letter) to know what my thoughts are on the late diſcovery, but I have many reaſons to be cautious how I ſay any thing. It is not my buſineſs to judge or condemn; I have only to be ſilent, and to pray for the church, for the king, and for you. I have delivered your letter to his majeſty, who has read it: this is all I can ſay to you about it, being oppreſſed with ſorrow."

The cardinal archbiſhop, being thus inſulted by a Jeſuit, took away the power of preaching and confeſſing from all the Jeſuits in France, excepting only a few of the moſt moderate and diſcreet. By his place he had like-

wiſe the dangerous right of hindering le Tellier from confeſſing the king; but he did not dare to irritate his ſovereign to ſuch a degree; and therefore left him reſpectfully in the hands of his enemy *. "I am apprehenſive (ſaid he writing to madam de Maintenon) that I ſhew too mean a ſubmiſſion to the king, in thus leaving power in the hands of one ſo unworthy of it. I pray God that he will open his eyes to the danger he is in by entruſting his ſoul to a man of ſuch a character †."

We read in ſeveral of the memoirs of thoſe times, that le Tellier declared either he muſt loſe his place, or the cardinal his. It is not improbable that he might think ſo, but very unlikely that he ſhould declare it.

When two parties are exaſperated againſt each other, both frequently take ſteps which prove fatal to them. The partizans of father

* Conſult madame de Maintenon's letters. It may eaſily be perceived that the author of this work was well acquainted with thoſe letters before they were publiſhed, and that he has taken nothing upon truſt.

† When we are provided with letters of ſuch good authority, we may boldly venture to quote them, as being the moſt valuable materials in hiſtory; but what truſt can be put in a letter which is ſuppoſed to have been written by cardinal de Noailles to the king, in which he is made to expreſs himſelf thus: "I was the firſt who laboured to ruin the clergy, in order to ſave your ſtate and ſupport your throne. It is not allowable for you to demand an account of my conduct." Is it probable that a wiſe and diſcreet ſubject ſhould write ſo inſulting and daring a letter to his ſovereign? This is no other than a mean and falſe imputation; it is to be found in page 141, Vol. V. of the Memoirs of Maintenon, and, as it is deſtitute of all authority and probability, ought not to meet with the leaſt regard.

le

le Tellier, and thoſe biſhops who aſpired at a cardinalſhip, made uſe of the royal authority to blow up thoſe ſparks which might have been extinguiſhed. Inſtead of imitating the conduct of Rome, which had ſeveral times impoſed ſilence on both parties; inſtead of curbing the inſolence of the Jeſuit, and ſoothing the cardinal, inſtead of prohibiting theſe controverſies, in the ſame manner as duels, and making the clergy, as well as the nobility, uſeful without being dangerous; in a word, inſtead of cruſhing the two parties by the weight of the ſupreme power, ſupported by reaſon and by all the magiſtrates, Lewis XIV. thought he acted right in ſolliciting Rome himſelf, for a declaration of war, and procuring that famous Conſtitution, which embittered all the remainder of his life.

Father le Tellier and his party ſent an hundred and three propoſitions to Rome, to be there cenſured, of which the holy office condemned one hundred and one. This bull, which was publiſhed in the month of September 1713, raiſed a flame throughout the whole kingdom, as ſoon as it made its appearance in France. The king had applied for it, as a means to prevent a ſchiſm, and it was likely to produce one. The clamour againſt it was general, becauſe, among thoſe hundred and one propoſitions, there were ſeveral which appeared to every one to carry the moſt innocent meaning, and the pureſt morality. A numerous aſſembly of biſhops was held at Paris: forty accepted the bull for the ſake of peace, but at the ſame time, they added certain explanations, to quiet the ſcruples of the people. The direct and unreſerved acceptation

tation was ſent to the pope, and the modifications were reſerved for the people. By this means, they thought at once to ſatisfy the pope, the king, and the people; but cardinal de Noailles, and ſeven other biſhops of this aſſembly, who joined with him, refuſed both the bull and its modifications: they wrote to the pope, requeſting to have theſe modifications from his holineſs himſelf. This was affronting him with the appearance of reſpect.

Accordingly the king would not permit it to be done, and hindered the letter being ſent, remanded the biſhops back to their dioceſſes, and forbad the cardinal to appear at court. This perſecution procured the archbiſhop an additional ſhare of credit with the public. The ſeven other biſhops again joined him: there was now a real diviſion in the epiſcopacy, among all ranks of the clergy, and all religious orders. Every one allowed, that the fundamental points of religion were not concerned in this diſpute, and yet a civil diſſention was raiſed in the minds of people, as if Chriſtianity itſelf was in danger of being ſubverted, and as many political reſources were put in action as in the moſt profane affairs.

Theſe reſources were chiefly employed to get the conſtitution received by the Sorbonne. And it was regiſtered, notwithſtanding the majority of votes was againſt it. The miniſtry 1714 could hardly find a ſufficient number of lettres de cachet to confine or baniſh thoſe who oppoſed it.

This bull had been regiſtered in parliament, with a proper reſervation of the ordinary rights of the crown, the liberties of the Gallican church,

church, and the power and jurisdiction of the bishops; but the public clamour got the better of obedience. Cardinal de Bissi, one of the most zealous defenders of the bull, acknowleged that it could not have been received with greater indignity at Geneva than it was at Paris.

The people were particularly incensed against father le Tellier. Nothing is more apt to excite indignation than a priest exalted to power; it seems a violation of his vows; but if he abuses this power, he is held in execration. Le Tellier presumed so much on his influence, that he even proposed the deposing of cardinal de Noailles in a national council. 1715

Thus did this priest make his prince, his penitent, and his religion, subservient to his revenge; and yet, with all this, I have strong reasons to believe that he was a well-meaning man: so apt are men to be blinded by their zeal and prejudices.

In order to prepare this council, which was to depose a man become the idol of Paris and of the whole kingdom, for the purity of his manners, the amiableness of his character, and still more by the persecution he suffered; they prevailed on Lewis XIV. to order a declaration to be registered in parliament, by which every bishop, who had not received the bull *purely* and *simply*, should be obliged to subscribe it, or be prosecuted as a rebel by the advocate-general. Chancellor Voisin, secretary at war, a rigid and arbitrary man, was the person who drew up this edict. D'Aguesseau, who understood the laws of the realm much better than Voisin, and had all that courage which youth naturally inspires, peremptorily refused to be concerned in such an affair.

affair. De Meſme, preſident of the council, demonſtrated to the king the conſequences likely to enſue. Thus the affair was protracted. The king was at this time in a dying condition, and theſe unhappy diſputes greatly diſquieted him, and contributed not a little to haſten his end. His mercileſs confeſſor was continually teazing him, tho' in this weak condition, by repeated exhortations to conſummate a work which would have been far from endearing his memory. The king's domeſtics, filled with indignation at the confeſſor's behaviour, twice refuſed him entrance into his majeſty's chamber, and at laſt earneſtly conjured him not to ſpeak to their royal maſter about the Conſtitution. Soon after the king died, and then a total change of affairs enſued.

The duke of Orleans, regent of the kingdom, having, immediately upon his aſſuming the reins of power, changed the whole form of Lewis XIV's government, and having ſubſtituted councils in the room of the offices of the ſecretaries of ſtate, erected a council of conſcience, of which cardinal de Noailles was made preſident. They baniſhed father le Tellier, loaded with the hatred of the public, and very little beloved by his own fraternity.

The biſhops who oppoſed the bull appealed to a future council *ex die*. The Sorbonne, the clergy of the diocese of Paris, and whole bodies of religious orders appealed likewiſe; and at length cardinal de Noailles made his appeal, in 1717, but he would not publiſh it at firſt; however it was printed, contrary to his inclination. The church of France remained divided into two factions, the Acceptants and the Recuſants.

enfants. The acceptants conſiſted of an hundred biſhops, who had adhered under *Lewis* XIV. to the Jeſuits and Capuchins. The other conſiſted of fifteen biſhops and the whole nation. The acceptants had the court of Rome for their defender; the recuſants were ſupported by the univerſities, the parliament, and the people. Volume upon volume, and letter upon letter, was printed; and each party treated the other as ſchiſmatics and heretics.

An archbiſhop of Rheims, named Mailli, a great and ſucceſsful partiſan of Rome, had ſubſcribed his name to two papers, which the parliament ordered to be burnt by the hangman. The archbiſhop, when he heard of this, ordered *Te Deum* to be ſung, and returned God thanks for having been thus ignominiouſly treated by ſchiſmatics. God rewarded him, and he was made a cardinal. The biſhop of Soiſſons having been dealt with in the ſame manner by the parliament, ſignified to that aſſembly, "That it did not belong to them to judge, even in caſes of high treaſon." For this he was mulcted in the ſum of ten thouſand livres; but the regent remitted the fine, left, as he ſaid, Soiſſons ſhould be made a cardinal alſo.

The court of Rome broke out into loud reproaches; much time was ſpent in negociations, in appealing and re-appealing, and all this about a few paſſages, now forgotten, of a book written by an old prieſt of fourſcore, who lived on charity at Amſterdam.

The extravagant project of the funds contributed more than one would imagine to reſtore peace to the church. The madneſs of the nation for ſtock-jobbing, and the greedineſs of every one

one to snap at the bait hung out for their avarice, was so great, that those who talked about Jansenism or the bull could find no one to listen to them. The people of Paris paid as little regard to these matters as to the war that was carrying on upon the frontiers of Spain. The sudden and immense fortunes made at that time; the excess to which luxury and voluptuousness of every kind was carried, put a stop to all ecclesiastical disputes. Thus pleasure and dissipation brought about that which all the power and politics of Lewis XIV. could not effect.

The duke of Orleans laid hold of this occasion to unite the church of France. In this his policy was interested; for he dreaded to see the time when Rome, Spain, and an hundred bishops, should be all united against him.

And here he had to prevail on cardinal Noailles, not only to receive the Constitution, which that prelate looked upon as scandalous, but also to withdraw his appeal, which he considered as lawful. He was to obtain more of him than his benefactor Lewis XIV. had in vain demanded. The duke of Orleans with reason expected great opposition from the parliament, whom he had banished to Pontoise. Nevertheless he gained all his points. A body of doctrine was composed, which partly satisfied both parties; and the cardinal was prevailed upon to give his promise, that he would at last accept it. The regent went himself to the grand council, with the princes of the blood and the peers, to get an edict registered, enjoining the acceptance of the bull, the suppression of all appeals, and the restoration of peace

and

and unanimity. The parliament, which had been mortified by seeing edicts carried to the grand council which it was their right to receive, and being likewise threatned to be removed from Pontoise to Blois, registered what had been entered by the council; but always with the customary reservations, *viz.* the preservation of the rights and liberties of the Gallican church, and the lords of the realm.

The cardinal-archbishop, who had given his word to withdraw his appeal whenever the parliament should obey, now saw himself necessitated to keep his promise; and the instrument of his recantation was published the 20th of August 1720.

Du Bois, the new archbishop of Cambray, son to an apothecary of Brive la Gaillarde, afterwards cardinal and prime minister, was the person who had the greatest share in bringing about this business, in which the power of Lewis XIV. had failed. No one is a stranger to the conduct, sentiments, and morals, of this minister. The licentious du Bois got the better of the pious Noailles. It is still remembered with what contempt the duke of Orleans and his minister spoke of the disputes which they opposed, and what ridicule they threw upon the controversial war. This contempt and ridicule contributed not a little to bring about a peace. People grew at length weary of such contests as afforded a subject of laughter to the rest of the world.

From this time all that was known in France by the name of Jansenism, Quietism, bulls, and theological disputes, sensibly declined; but some

ſome biſhops who had appealed, ſtill continued obſtinately attached to their opinions.

Under the adminiſtration of cardinal de Fleury, an attempt was made to extirpate the remains of the party, by depoſing one of the moſt ſtubborn prelates. To this end, old Soanin, biſhop of the little town of Senés, was fixed on for an example; a man equally pious and inflexible, but of no family nor influence.

He was condemned by the provincial ſynod of Ambrun, in 1728, ſuſpended from his epiſcopal and clerical functions, and baniſhed by the court to Auvergne, when above eighty years old. This treatment occaſioned a few murmurings, which proved of no conſequence. There is not at preſent any nation which murmurs more, obeys better, and forgets ſooner than the French.

Some remains of fanaticiſm ſtill continued among a ſmall number of the people of Paris. Certain enthuſiaſts imagined, that a deacon named Paris, brother to a counſellor of parliament, one who had appealed and reappealed, who lay buried in the church-yard of St. Medard, was to perform miracles; ſome of the party, who went to pray at his tomb, had their imaginations ſo heated, that their diſordered organs produced ſlight convulſions. Upon this the tomb was ſurrounded by ſwarms of people, who continued to flock thither both day and night: ſome got upon the tomb, and took the motion they gave their bodies in mounting for miraculous convulſions. The ſecret abettors of the party encouraged this phrenzy. They prayed at the tomb in the vulgar language; no-

nothing was now talked of but the deaf hearing certain words, the blind partly reſtored to ſight, and the lame walking upright for ſome moments; theſe pretended miracles were even atteſted upon oath by a crowd of witneſſes, who thought they had beheld them, becauſe they came thither fully prepoſſeſſed that they ſhould behold them.

The government left this epidemical madneſs to itſelf for a month; but the concourſe of people became ſo great, and the miracles ſo frequent, that they were at laſt obliged to ſhut up the church-yard, and place a guard round it; theſe enthuſiaſts then went to work their miracles in houſes. This tomb of Deacon Paris proved in effect the grave of Janſeniſm, in the opinion of all ſenſible people. Such farces might have had ſerious conſequences in more ignorant times; but thoſe who encouraged them ſeemed to have miſtaken the age they lived in.

The ſuperſtition however was carried ſo far, that a counſellor of parliament had the madneſs to preſent the king, in 1736, with a collection of theſe miracles, ſupported by a conſiderable number of atteſtations. This madman, the inſtrument and victim of others as mad as himſelf, ſays in the memorial preſented to the king, "That credit ought to be given to witneſſes who ſuffered death in ſupport of their evidence." If all other books were to be loſt, and this only was to remain, poſterity would imagine our age to be the æra of ignorance and barbariſm.

Theſe extravagancies were in France the expiring ſighs of a ſect, which, being no longer ſupported by an Arnauld, a Paſcal, nor a Nicole, and confined only to a few convulſionaries,

ries, is fallen into utter contempt; and we ſhould hear no more mention of thoſe diſputes which diſgrace reaſon, and do injury to religion, were it not for ſome buſy minds, who are continually raking in theſe extinguiſhed aſhes, for a remaining ſpark of fire, which they endeavour to blow up into a new flame; but even ſhould they ſucceed, the diſpute concerning Moliniſm and Janſeniſm, will never again be the object of diſſention. What has once become ridiculous, can never more be dangerous. The diſpute will change its nature; for mankind never want a pretext to injure each other, tho' they may be without a cauſe.

The Jeſuits ſeemed involved in the fall of Janſeniſm; their arms remained uſeleſs for want of adverſaries to employ them on; they loſt that credit at court which le Tellier had ſo groſsly abuſed; their journal of Trevoux gained them neither the eſteem nor friendſhip of the learned world. The biſhops, over whom they had formerly domineered, confounded them with the other religious orders; and theſe, who had been kept under by them, now humbled them in their turn. The parliament made them ſenſible, more than once, of the opinion they entertained of them, by condemning ſome of their books, which would otherwiſe have been forgotten. The univerſity, which now began to make a ſhining figure in literature, and had an excellent method of educating youth, robbed them of moſt of their pupils; and they were obliged to wait with patience till time ſhould furniſh them with men of genius, and a favourable opportunity to regain their former aſcendancy.

It

It would be very useful for those who are infatuated with these kinds of disputes, to look into the general history of the world; for in observing the multitude of different nations, manners, and religions, they will see how very insignificant a figure a Molenist and a Jansenist makes on the theatre of the world. They will then blush at their mad fondness for a party which is lost in the common crowd, and swallowed up in the immensity of things.

CHAP. CCIX.

Of QUIETISM.

AMIDST the factions of Calvinism and the disputes of Jansenism, there happened yet another division in France about Quietism. It was an unhappy consequence of the progress of human understanding in the age of Lewis XIV. that it excited efforts to go beyond the limits prescribed to our knowledge; or rather, it was a proof that this progress might be still further extended.

The controversy about Quietism is one of those extravagant sallies of the imagination and theological subtleties, which would never have left any impression on the memory of mankind, had it not been for the names of two illustrious rivals in dispute. A woman without any credit, or even real understanding, who had only an overheated imagination, set at variance two of the greatest men in the church. Her name was Bou-

Bouvieres de la Motte. Her family was originally of Montargis. She had been married to the ſon of Guion, the contractor for the canal of Briaire: being left a widow when very young, with a conſiderable fortune, a tolerable ſhare of beauty, and a diſpoſition formed for diſtinguiſhing herſelf in public, ſhe became poſſeſſed with what is called Spirituality. She had for her confeſſor a Barnabite monk, of the country of Geneva, named La Combe. This man, noted for what is common enough, a medly of paſſions and religion, and who died mad, plunged the mind of his penitent in myſtical contemplations, to which ſhe was already but too much inclined. The deſire of being a ſiſter Thereſa, in France, prevented her from diſcerning the great difference between the genius of the French and Spaniards, and carried her even to greater lengths than ſiſter Thereſa. The ambition of having diſciples, the ſtrongeſt perhaps of every other ſpecies of ambition, took entire poſſeſſion of her heart.

She and her confeſſor went into that ſmall territory where the titular biſhop of Geneva holds his reſidence. There ſhe acquired great authority by her extenſive charities, and held ſeveral conferences. She preached up an intire ſelf-renunciation, the tranquil ſtate of the ſoul, and the annihilation of all its faculties; inward worſhip, and pure and diſintereſted love, ſuch as is neither debaſed by fear, nor exalted by the hope of reward.

Tender and flexible imaginations, eſpecially thoſe of women, and ſome young eccleſiaſtics who loved the word of God, as proceeding from the mouth of a fine woman, rather more than they

they believed it, were eaſily led away with an eloquence of delivery, the only thing calculated to perſuade minds already favourably diſpoſed. She made proſelytes; but was ſoon driven away from thence by the biſhop, with her confeſſor. They went next to Grenoble; there ſhe publiſhed a little piece intitled, *Le moyen court*, The Short Way, and another called *les Torrens*, the Torrents, both written in the ſame ſtyle ſhe preached; but in a ſhort time ſhe was likewiſe obliged to leave Grenoble.

Full already of the pleaſing thoughts of being ranked among the number of confeſſors, ſhe had a viſion, and propheſied, This prophecy ſhe ſent to father La Combe: "All hell, ſaid ſhe, ſhall riſe up to ſtop the progreſs of the inward ſpirit and the formation of Chriſt Jeſus in ſouls. And ſo great ſhall be the ſtorm, that not one ſtone ſhall remain upon another; and I foreſee that throughout the whole earth, there ſhall be troubles, wars, and great overthrows. The woman ſhall be pregnant with the inward ſpirit, and the dragon ſhall ſtand up before her."

The prediction was in part verified: hell indeed did not riſe up againſt her; but on her return to Paris with her confeſſor, where both endeavoured to ſpread their doctrine in 168-, the archbiſhop Harlai de Chanvallon, obtained an order from the king to confine La Combe as a ſeducer, and to ſhut up in a convent madame Guion as a perſon diſordered in her ſenſes, and who ſtood in need of a cure. But before this blow, madame Guion had gained ſuch a protection as now proved of ſervice to her. In the palace of St. Cyr, then only in its infancy,

ſhe had a couſin named madame de la Maiſon-Forte, a favourite with madame de Maintenon. She had likewiſe inſinuated herſelf into the good graces of the dutcheſſes of Chevreuſe and Beauvilliers. Theſe, her good friends, exclaimed one and all loudly againſt archbiſhop Harlai, that he who was ſo well known to have a fondneſs for the fair ſex, ſhould perſecute a woman only for diſcourſing on the love of God.

Madame de Maintenon, by her powerful influence, procured Guion her liberty, and got the archbiſhop of Paris ſilenced. After ſhe was releaſed ſhe went to Verſailles, and introduced herſelf into the palace of St. Cyr, where, after having dined with madame de Maintenon and another perſon, ſhe aſſiſted at the devout conferences held by the abbé de Fenelon. The princeſs of Harcourt, and the dutcheſſes of Chevreuſe, Beauvilliers, and Charôt, were of this myſtical ſociety.

The abbé Fenelon, then preceptor to the children of France, was the moſt engaging man about the court. He had naturally a tender heart, and a mild and lively imagination. He had embelliſhed his mind with all that was moſt excellent in the Belles Lettres. He poſſeſſed a fine taſte, with many other amiable qualifications, and preferred the affecting and ſublime in divinity, to the gloomy and abſtruſe. With all theſe endowments he had a certain romantic turn, which inſpired him, not with the reveries of madame Guion, but with a taſte for the doctrine of Spirituality, which was not very unlike the notions of that lady.

His imagination was heated with candour and virtue, as others are inflamed by their paſſions.

ſtain. His paſſion was to love God purely for himſelf. He ſaw in madame Guion a ſpotleſs ſoul, fraught with the ſame inclinations as his own, and therefore made no difficulty to aſſociate with her.

It was ſtrange that ſuch a man ſhould be led away by a weak woman, who pretended to revelations, to prophecies, and ſuch idle ſtuff; who was ready to be choaked with inward grace, and made her attendants unlace her that ſhe might empty herſelf (according to her own expreſſion) of a ſuperabundance of grace, in order to communicate it to the body of the choſen perſon who ſate next her. But Fenelon, in his friendſhip and myſtical notions, was as a perſon in love: he excuſed the errors, and attached himſelf only to that conformity of opinion with which he had been firſt taken.

Madame Guion, elevated and emboldened by the acquiſition of ſuch a diſciple, whom ſhe called her ſon, and depending on madame de Maintenon's favour, propagated her notions in St. Cyr. Godet, biſhop of Chartres, in whoſe dioceſe St. Cyr is, was alarmed, and made complaints. The archbiſhop of Paris likewiſe threatned to renew his former proſecution.

Madame de Maintenon, who intended St. Cyr wholly for a peaceable retreat; who knew how much the king was an enemy to all novelty, and who had no occaſion to put herſelf at the head of a ſect to acquire influence, and had beſides her own credit and repoſe only in view, broke off all correſpondence with madame Guion, and forbade her to appear again at St. Cyr.

The abbé de Fenelon ſaw the ſtorm gathering, and was apprehenſive of being diſappointed of the great employments to which he aſpired. He therefore adviſed his female friend to put herſelf in the hands of the famous Boſſuet, biſhop of Meaux, who was regarded as a father of the church. She accordingly ſubmitted herſelf to the deciſions of this prelate, received the ſacrament from him, and delivered up all her writings to his examination.

The biſhop of Meaux, with the king's permiſſion, choſe for his aſſiſtants in this affair, the biſhop of Chalons, afterwards cardinal de Noailles, and the abbé Tronſon ſuperior of St. Sulpicius. They had a private meeting at the village of Iſſi, near Paris. Chanvallon, archbiſhop of Paris, jealous that any other perſons ſhould ſet themſelves up as judges in his diocese, immediately fixed up a public cenſure on the books they had under their examination. Madame Guion retired to the city of Meaux, ſubſcribed to all that biſhop Boſſuet required of her, and promiſed to dogmatiſe no more for the future.

In the mean time Fenelon was promoted to the archbiſhopric of Cambray in 1695, and conſecrated by the biſhop of Meaux. It might have been preſumed, that an affair now dormant, and that had been from the beginning only a ſubject of ridicule, would never have been revived. But madame Guion, being accuſed of continuing to preach her doctrines after ſhe had promiſed ſilence, was ſeized by order of the king in the ſame year 1695, and confined priſoner at Vincennes, as if ſhe had been a perſon dangerous to the ſtate. She could not poſ-

poſſibly be ſo; and her pious follies did not merit the attention of the ſovereign. During her confinement at Vincennes ſhe compoſed a large volume of myſtic poetry, more wretched even than her proſe. She wrote parodies upon verſes of operas, and would often ſing the following lines:

L'amour pur et parfait va plus loin qu'on ne penſe:
On ne ſait pas, lorſqu'il commence,
Tout ce qu'il doit coûter un jour.
Mon cœur n'auroit connu Vincennes ni ſouffrance,
S'il n'eût connu le pur amour.

Pure, perfect love ſurmounts yon ſtarry ſkies!
We little know when firſt it takes its riſe,
What pangs the ſubject heart will prove;
Vincennes had never ſhock'd, nor tears bedimm'd theſe eyes,
Had I ne'er felt this pure and perfect love.

The opinions of mankind are frequently influenced by time, place, and circumſtances. While madame Guion was confined in priſon, who in one of her phrenzies had imagined herſelf married to Jeſus Chriſt, and from that time would never invoke the ſaints, ſaying, that it was not for the miſtreſs of the family to addreſs herſelf to her ſervants; at this very time, I ſay, there was application made to Rome for the canonization of Mary d'Agreda*, who

* This enthuſiaſt, who was abbeſs of a convent at Agreda, pretended to have received divine orders to write the life of the Virgin Mary, which was accordingly publiſhed, under the title of the Myſtic City of God, and appears to be a ſtrange medley of madneſs and fanaticiſm.

had pretended to more viſions and revelations than all the reſt of the myſtical tribe put together; and as an unanſwerable inſtance of thoſe contradictions with which the world abounds, at the Sorbonne they proſecuted as an heretic this very d'Agreda, whom they wanted to make a ſaint in Spain. The univerſity of Salamanca condemned the Sorbonne, and was in return condemned by it.

Boſſuet, who had long looked upon himſelf as the father and maſter of Fenelon, beheld with jealous eyes the riſing reputation and credit of his diſciple; and deſirous of preſerving that aſcendant which he had over all the reſt of his brethren, he required the new archbiſhop to join with him in the condemnation of madame Guion, and to ſubſcribe to his paſtoral inſtructions. Fenelon refuſed to ſacrifice to him either his ſentiments or his friend. A medium was propoſed, and mutual promiſes made. The one accuſed the other of breach of faith. The archbiſhop of Cambray, when he departed for his dioceſe, cauſed his book entitled, "The Maxims of the Saints," to be printed at Paris; a work in which he endeavoured to palliate the charge brought againſt his friend, and to reveal the orthodox notions of devout contemplatiſts, who raiſe themſelves above the ſenſes, and aim at a ſtate of perfection to which ordinary ſouls ſeldom aſpire. The biſhop of Meaux and his adherents vehemently oppoſed this book. They complained of it to the king, as if it had been as dangerous as it was unintelligible. His majeſty ſpoke of it to Boſſuet, of whoſe reputation and underſtanding he had a great opi-

opinion. This prelate, throwing himſelf on his knees before his prince, implored his pardon for not having before informed him of the fatal hereſy of the archbiſhop of Cambray. The king and madame de Maintenon immediately conſulted father de la Chaiſe upon the affair, who made anſwer, that the archbiſhop's book was an excellent piece; that it had greatly edified all the Jeſuits; and that the Janſeniſts only diſapproved of it. The biſhop of Meaux was not a Janſeniſt, but he had ſtudied ſome of their beſt writings. He did not like the Jeſuits, nor they him.

The court and the city were divided; and the attention of every one being engroſſed by this affair, the Janſeniſts had a little reſpite.

Boſſuet wrote againſt Fenelon, and both ſent their works to pope Innocent XII. ſubmitting themſelves to his deciſion. Circumſtances were rather againſt Fenelon; for not long before, the court of Rome had ſtrongly condemned, in the perſon of Molinos the Spaniard *, the Quietiſm of

* Michael Molinos, a Spaniſh prieſt, and founder of the ſect of Quietiſts. He publiſhed his book on ſpiritual conduct at Rome, and was much followed for a ſeries of years; but his reputation having at length awakened the jealouſy of the Jeſuits, they employed all their art and influence for his deſtruction. A proceſs was inſtituted againſt him in the general congregation of the inquiſition of Rome, held in preſence of the pope and the cardinal inquiſitors. Sixty-eight of the propoſitions were condemned as falſe and pernicious, ſcandalous, blaſphemous, and heretical. He was compelled to abjure them publicly in the habit of a penitent, and condemned to perpetual impriſonment, in which he died. His real character was that of an inoffenſive enthuſiaſt, who aſpired at a ſublime communication with God, by means of abſtracted contemplation.

which the archbiſhop of Cambray was now accuſed. Cardinal d'Etrees, the French ambaſſador at Rome, was the perſon who had proſecuted Molinos. This cardinal, whom we have ſeen in his old age more engaged in the pleaſures of ſociety than in theology, had proceeded againſt Molinos merely to pleaſe the enemies of that unfortunate prieſt, and had even prevailed upon the king to ſollicit his condemnation at Rome, which he obtained but too eaſily: ſo that Lewis XIV. proved, unknown to himſelf, the moſt formidable enemy of the pure love of the myſtics.

In matters of this delicate nature, nothing is more eaſy than to diſcover paſſages in a book under conſideration reſembling thoſe in one already condemned. The archbiſhop of Cambray had on his ſide the Jeſuits, and cardinal de Bouillon, lately ambaſſador from France to Rome. The biſhop of Meaux had his own great name and the principal prelates of France for his adherents. He preſented to the king the ſubſcribed declarations of many of the biſhops, and a great number of doctors, who all condemned the Maxims of the Saints.

So great was the authority of the biſhop of Meaux, that father de la Chaiſe durſt not vindicate the archbiſhop of Cambray to his royal penitent, and madame Maintenon entirely abandoned her friend. The king wrote to pope Innocent XII. that having had the archbiſhop's book laid before him as a dangerous work, he had put it into the hands of the nuncio, and earneſtly requeſted his holineſs to give judgment upon it.

It

It was insinuated, and even publicly affirmed at Rome, nor are there wanting those who still believe the report, that the archbishop of Cambray was thus persecuted for no other reason but his having opposed the private marriage of the king with madame Maintenon. The anecdote-makers pretend that this lady had engaged father de la Chaise to press the king to acknowledge her for queen; that the Jesuit had artfully thrown this dangerous commission upon the abbé Fenelon; but that this preceptor of the children of the blood, preferred the honour of his country and that of his royal pupils to his own interest, and had thrown himself at the feet of Lewis XIV. to prevent a marriage, which, from its unaccountable strangeness, would have injured that monarch more with posterity than all the transitory gratifications of his life could have recompensed.

This tale is still to be found in the history of Lewis XIV. printed at Avignon. Those who have had access to that monarch, and to madame Maintenon, know how far this is from the truth. But it is true that Fenelon, having continued his education of the duke of Burgundy after his promotion to the archbishopric of Cambray, and the king during this interval having heard some confused talk about Fenelon's connection with madame Guion, and madame de la Maison-Fort, was apprehensive that Fenelon might inspire his pupil with maxims too rigid, and such principles of government and morality, as would perhaps one day become an indirect censure upon that air of greatness, that thirst for glory, those wars undertaken on the

moſt frivolous occaſion, and that taſte for luxury and pleaſures, which had characteriſed his reign.

The king was deſirous of having ſome converſation with the new archbiſhop on his political principles. Fenelon, full of his ideas, diſcovered to the king ſome part of the principles which he afterwards unfolded in thoſe paſſages of his Telemachus where he treats of government; principles which better ſuit with Plato's ideal republic, than the true manner in which mankind are to be governed. The king, after this converſation, ſaid, that he had been diſcourſing with the fineſt and moſt chimerical genius in his kingdom. The duke of Burgundy was made acquainted with what his majeſty had ſaid, and repeated it afterwards to Mr. de Maleſieux, his maſter for geometry. I had this from Mr. de Maleſieux himſelf, and it was afterwards confirmed to me by cardinal Fleury.

It is certain, that from this converſation the king readily believed Fenelon to be as romantic in his religious as in his political notions.

The congregation of the Holy Office named a Dominican, a Jeſuit, a Benedictin, two Cordeliers, a Feuillant, * and an Auguſtin, to take cognizance of the affair. Theſe are what they call at Rome the conſultors. The cardinals and prelates generally leave to theſe monks the ſtudy of theology, to be more at leiſure to follow politics, intrigues, or the pleaſures of an indolent life.

* A ſet of begging friars of the order of St. Bernard.

The

The conſultors, in thirty-ſeven ſittings, examined as many propoſitions, and declared them erroneous by a majority of voices; and the pope, at the head of a congregation of cardinals, condemned them by a brief publiſhed and fixed up at Rome the thirteenth day of March 1699.

The biſhop of Meaux triumphed; but the archbiſhop of Cambray gained a more glorious victory in his defeat. He ſubmitted without reſtriction or reſerve. He even mounted the pulpit himſelf at Cambray, to condemn his own book, and forbade his friends to defend it. This ſingular inſtance of condeſcenſion in a man of his learning, who might have raiſed a conſiderable party to himſelf, even from his perſecution, added to his known candour and ingenuity, gained him the good will of every one, and made his antagoniſt almoſt hated for his victory. He ever afterwards continued to reſide in his dioceſe, like the good archbiſhop and the man of letters. That ſweetneſs of manners which ſhewed itſelf in his converſation as well as in his writings, made all who had the happineſs of being acquainted with him, his affectionate friends. The perſecution he underwent, and his Telemachus, gained him the veneration of all Europe. The Engliſh in particular, though they carried the war into his dioceſe, were the moſt eager to ſhew him reſpect. The duke of Marlborough took particular care that his lands ſhould be ſpared. He was always held dear by the duke of Burgundy, who was his pupil; and had that prince lived, he would have had a ſhare in the adminiſtration.

In his philoſophical and honourable retreat, we may ſee with what difficulty a man can diſ-

engage himſelf from court. He always ſpoke on this head in ſuch a feeling manner as broke through all his appearance of reſignation. Several pieces upon philoſophy, divinity, and polite literature, were the fruits of the leiſure hours of his retirement. The duke of Orleans, afterwards regent of the kingdom, conſulted him on certain difficult points which concern all mankind, and yet are ſeldom thought of by them. He aſked him whether the exiſtence of a Deity could be demonſtrated? whether this Deity required worſhip of us? what worſhip he moſt approved? and whether a miſtaken choice was offenſive to him? He ſtarted many queſtions of a like nature, as a philoſopher who ſought inſtruction; and the archbiſhop anſwered him like an able philoſopher and divine.

After having been worſted in ſcholaſtic diſputes, it would have been more agreeable to his character, had he not intermeddled in the controverſy of Janſeniſm; nevertheleſs, he engaged in it. Cardinal Noailles had formerly joined with the ſtrongeſt ſide againſt him. The archbiſhop of Cambray did the ſame in his turn. He was in hopes of being recalled to court and conſulted; ſo hard is it for the mind of man to diſengage itſelf from public affairs, after having been once embarked in them. His deſires nevertheleſs were as moderate as his writings; and even towards the latter part of his life, he at laſt deſpiſed all diſputation, reſembling in this one particular Huet biſhop of Avranches, one of the moſt learned men in Europe, who in his latter days acknowledged the vanity of almoſt all ſcience, and of the human underſtanding itſelf.

The

The archbiſhop of Cambray, (who would believe it!) thus turned an air of Lulli:

Jeune, j'étois trop ſage,
Et voulois trop ſavoir;
Je ne veux en partage
Que badinage,
Et touché au dernier âge,
Sans rien prevoir.

When young, I was exceeding wiſe,
And pil'd up knowledge in a heap:
Now nothing I prize,
But trifles and toys,
And creep to the grave without noiſe;
Nor wiſh to look before I leap.

He compoſed theſe verſes in preſence of his nephew the marquis of Fenelon, afterwards ambaſſador at the Hague, from whom I had them, and can warrant the truth of this fact. It is a circumſtance of very little importance in itſelf, only as it is a proof that in the grave tranquility of old age, we often view in a different light what appeared ſo great and intereſting to us at a time of life, when the active mind is the ſport of its own deſires and deluſions *.

* The above verſes are to be met with in the poetical works of madame Guion: but the archbiſhop's nephew having aſſured me more than once that they were his uncle's, and that he heard him repeat them the very day he made them, I thought I was in juſtice bound to reſtore them to their real author.

CHAP. CCX.

DISPUTES upon the CEREMONIES of the CHINESE.

IT was not ſufficient for the diſquiet of our minds, that we diſputed at the end of ſeventeen hundred years upon the articles of our own religion, but we muſt likewiſe introduce into our quarrels thoſe of the Chineſe. This diſpute however was not productive of any great diſturbances; but it ſerved more than any other to characteriſe that buſy, contentious, and jarring ſpirit, which prevails in our climates.

Matthew Ricci the Jeſuit, had been one of the firſt miſſionaries to China at the end of the ſeventeenth century. The Chineſe were then, and ſtill are almoſt the ſame in philoſophy and literature, that we were two hundred years ago. The veneration they have for their antient maſters makes them afraid of paſſing certain bounds. A progreſs in the ſciences is the work of time and a daring genius: but morality and policy being more eaſy to comprehend than the ſciences, and theſe being brought to perfection amongſt them before the other arts, it has happened that the Chineſe, who have continued above two thouſand years within the ſame limits they had at firſt attained, have continued but middling proficients in the ſciences; and are the firſt people in the world in morals and policy, as well as the moſt antient.

After

After Ricci, many other Jeſuits found the way into this vaſt empire; and by the help of the European ſciences, they ſecretly ſcattered ſome ſeeds of Chriſtianity amongſt the children of that people, whom they took care to inſtruct whenever they had an opportunity. Some Dominicans, who were joined in this miſſion, accuſed the Jeſuits of permitting idolatry, whilſt they preached up Chriſtianity. This was a delicate point, as well as the conduct to be obſerved in China.

The laws and tranquility of this great empire are founded on the moſt natural, and at the ſame time the moſt ſacred of all rights, the reſpect of children to their parents. To this reſpect they join that which they owe to their firſt maſters in morality, and eſpecially to Con-fut-zee, or Confucius, as we call him, an ancient philoſopher, who had taught them the principles of virtue five hundred years before the founding of Chriſtianity.

Every family aſſembles on a particular day to do honour to their anceſtors; and the learned meet publicly to honour Con-fut-zee. They proſtrate themſelves according to their manner of ſaluting their ſuperiors, which was formerly called adoration throughout all Aſia. They burn wax tapers and perfumes. The colaos, to whom the Spaniards have given the name of mandarins, twice a year kill ſeveral animals, near the hall where Con-fut-zee is honoured, and afterwards feaſt upon them. Are theſe ceremonies idolatrous, or are they merely civil inſtitutions? Do they hereby acknowledge their parents and Con-fut-zee for deities? or are they

even

even invoked as our ſaints? Is this in ſhort a political cuſtom, which ſome of the more ſuperſtitious Chineſe abuſe? Theſe were queſtions that could not eaſily be cleared up in China by ſtrangers, and which we were unable to decide in Europe.

The Dominicans laid an account of the cuſtoms of the Chineſe before the Inquiſition of Rome in 1645. The holy office, from their repreſentation, forbade the uſe of theſe ceremonies till the pope ſhould give his deciſion.

The Jeſuits defended the cauſe of the Chineſe and their ceremonies, which in their opinion could not be forbidden, without for ever barring the entrance againſt Chriſtianity in an empire ſo jealous of its cuſtoms. They preſented their reaſons on this head. The inquiſition in 1656 permitted that the literati ſhould continue to revere Con-fut-zee, and the Chineſe children to honour their anceſtors: but proteſted at the ſame time againſt all ſuperſtition, if there was any.

While the affair remained thus undecided, the miſſionaries always divided, and the cauſe ſolliciting at Rome from time to time, the Jeſuits at Pekin inſinuated themſelves ſo far into the eſteem of the emperor Camhi, by their mathematical knowledge, that this prince, renowned for his virtue and goodneſs, permitted them at length to exerciſe their office of miſſionaries, and teach Chriſtianity publicly. But here it may be neceſſary to obſerve, that this deſpotic monarch, grandſon to the conqueror of China, was nevertheleſs ſubject by cuſtom to the laws of the empire; that he could not by his own authority alone permit the exerciſe of Chriſti-

ſianity, and was obliged to ſollicit one of the tribunals upon that head; and that he himſelf drew up two petitions in the name of the Jeſuits. At laſt, in 1672, Chriſtianity was permitted in China, through the indefatigable pains and addreſs of the Jeſuits alone.

There is at Paris a houſe eſtabliſhed for foreign miſſionaries. Some prieſts educated here were then in China. The pope, who ſends apoſtolic vicars into all the countries, which they call the regions of infidelity, made choice of a prieſt named Maigrot, out of this houſe, to go to preſide as vicar in the Chineſe miſſion, and gave him the biſhopric of Conon, a little Chineſe province in Fo-kien. This Frenchman, thus become a biſhop in China, began with not only declaring the rites performed for the dead ſuperſtitious and idolatrous, but alſo pronounced the learned men of that nation atheiſts: ſo that the Jeſuits had now more to do to ſtruggle againſt their brother miſſionaries, than againſt the mandarins and the people. They repreſented to the court of Rome, that it was not conſiſtent that the Chineſe ſhould be at once atheiſts and idolaters. It was urged againſt theſe learned men, that they admitted only matter; but then the difficulty was to account for their invoking the ſouls of their deceaſed anceſtors, and that of Con-fut-zee. One of theſe charges evidently deſtroyed the other, unleſs it was pretended that they admitted contradictions in China, as is ſo frequently done with us. But it was neceſſary to be well acquainted with their language and manners to reconcile this ſeeming contradiction. This affair remained a long time before the court of Rome; and in the mean

mean while the Jeſuits were attacked on all ſides.

Father le Comte, one of their moſt learned miſſionaries, had expreſſed himſelf thus in his memoirs of China: "This people have had amongſt them for two thouſand years a knowledge of the true God; and ſacrificed to the Creator of the univerſe in the moſt ancient temple of the world; China practiſed the pureſt leſſons of morality, when Europe was in darkneſs and corruption."

We have already ſeen that this nation goes up, by an authentic hiſtory, and by a ſucceſſion of thirty-ſix calculated eclipſes, even beyond the æra in which we place the deluge. The learned men of that nation have never had any other religion than that which conſiſts in the adoration of a ſupreme being. Their worſhip was juſtice. They could not be acquainted with the laws of Moſes; nor the more perfect law of the Meſſiah, which remained ſo long unknown to the nations of the Weſt and North. It is certain that Gaul, Germany, England, and all the North, was plunged in the moſt barbarous idolatry, when the tribunals of the vaſt empire of China cultivated morality and the obſervance of laws, at the ſame time acknowledging one ſole God, whom they always worſhipped in the ſame ſimple manner, without the leaſt variation. Theſe evident truths were more than ſufficient to juſtify the expreſſions made uſe of by father le Comte; but as there was ſomewhat in theſe aſſertions which ſeemed to ſtrike againſt the received notions, they were attacked in the Sorbonne.

The

The abbé Boileau, brother to Despréaux, as great a critic as his brother, and a greater enemy to the Jesuits, declared (in 1700) this encomium on the Chinese a direct blasphemy. This abbé was a man of a lively and peculiar genius, who wrote the most serious and bold things in a humorous stile. He was author of a book entitled Flagellantes, and some other pieces of the like kind. He said he wrote them in Latin, for fear of being censured by the bishops. His brother said of him, "That if he had not been a doctor of the Sorbonne, he would have been a doctor of the Italian comedy." He declaimed violently against the Jesuits and the Chinese, and began by saying, "That the encomiums on that people had shook his Christian brain." The brains of the rest of that assembly seemed to be not much less disordered. There were some debates on the subject. A reverend doctor, named Le Sage, was of opinion that twelve of their brethren, of the most robust constitution, should be sent upon the spot to instruct themselves in every particular. The debate grew warm; but at length the Sorbonne declared the encomiums given to the Chinese false, scandalous, rash, impious, and heretical.

This dispute, which was carried on with great warmth, inflamed that about the ceremonies; and at length pope Clement XI. the year after sent a legate to China. The person he made choice of on the occasion was Thomas Maillard de Tournon, titulary patriarch of Antioch, who did not arrive in China till 1705. The court of Pekin were till that time wholly ignorant that they had been under trial at Rome and Paris. The emperor Cambi

at

at firſt received the patriarch de Tournon with great civility. But how great was his ſurprize when he underſtood by the legate's interpreters, that the Chriſtians who preached their religion in his empire, did not agree amongſt themſelves, and that this legate came to decide a diſpute of which the court of Pekin had never till then heard the leaſt mention. The legate gave his majeſty to underſtand, that all the miſſionaries, except the Jeſuits, condemned the ancient cuſtoms of his empire, and even ſuſpected his Chineſe majeſty and all the learned men of his kingdom to be atheiſts, who admitted only of a material heaven. He added, that he had in his dominions the learned biſhop of Conon, who would explain theſe matters more fully, if his majeſty would condeſcend to give him an hearing. The monarch found his ſurprize encreaſe when he was informed that he had biſhops in his empire; and the reader will be not leſs ſo, when he finds this prince carried his indulgence ſo far as to permit the biſhop of Conon to come to him to talk againſt his religion, the cuſtoms of his country, and even againſt himſelf. The biſhop of Conon was admitted to an audience. He was very little acquainted with the Chineſe language. The emperor began by aſking him the meaning of four characters which were drawn in gold above his throne. Maigrot could read only two; but he maintained that the words *King-tien*, which the emperor had written in his pocket-book, did not ſignify *adore the Lord of Heaven*. The emperor had the patience to explain to him, that it was the preciſe meaning of theſe words, and even condeſcended to enter into a long argument, in which

which he vindicated the honours paid to the dead. The biſhop however remained inflexible; and it may well be believed that the Jeſuits had more intereſt at court than him. The emperor, who by the laws of the country, might have put him to death, contented himſelf with only baniſhing him; and paſſed an ordinance, that all the Europeans willing to remain in his empire, ſhould for the future be obliged to take his letters of protection, and undergo an examination.

As for de Tournon, the legate, he had orders to quit the capital. As ſoon as he got to Nantkin he publiſhed a mandate, entirely condemning all the Chineſe rites, in regard to the dead, and forbidding the uſing that expreſſion which the emperor uſed to ſignify *the God of heaven*.

The legate upon this was baniſhed to Macao, of which the Chineſe always retain the ſovereignty, though they permit the Portugueſe to have a governor there. Whilſt he was in his confinement here, the pope ſent him a hat; but this only ſerved to make him die a cardinal, for he ended his days there in 1710. The enemies of the Jeſuits laid his death to their charge. It was ſufficient if they imputed his baniſhment to them.

Theſe diviſions among ſtrangers who came into the empire, on pretence of inſtructing it, greatly diſcredited the religion they preached. It ſuffered ſtill more when the court, who began to ſtudy the Europeans more nearly than heretofore, diſcovered, that not only the miſſionaries were thus divided, but that likewiſe among the traders who came from Canton, there

there were ſeveral ſects, ſworn enemies to each other.

The emperor Camhi did not cool towards the Jeſuits, but greatly towards Chriſtianity. His ſucceſſor drove out all the miſſionaries, and proſcribed the Chriſtian religion. This was partly the effect of thoſe diſputes and that inſolence, with which ſtrangers had pretended to know better than the emperor and his magiſtrates, in what ſenſe the Chineſe honoured their anceſtors.

Theſe diſputes, ſo long the object of attention at Paris, as well as many others, ariſing from a mixture of idleneſs and reſtleſſneſs, are now utterly forgotten; people are ſurpriſed that they ever produced ſuch animoſities; and the ſpirit of philoſophy, which daily gains ground, bids fair to ſecure the public tranquillity.

CHAP. CCXI.

A RECAPITULATION of the whole of the FORREGOING HISTORY, with the POINT of LIGHT in which it ought to be conſidered.

I HAVE now gone thro' the immenſe ſcene of revolutions, that the world has experienced ſince the time of Charlemagne: and to what have they all tended? to deſolation, and the loſs of millions of lives! Every great event has been a capital misfortune. Hiſtory has kept no account of times of peace and tranquillity; it relates only ravages and diſaſters.

We

We have beheld our Europe overſpread with barbarians after the fall of the Roman empire; and theſe barbarians, when become Chriſtians, continually at war with the Mahometans, or elſe deſtroying each other.

We have ſeen Italy deſolated by perpetual wars between city and city; the Guelphs and Gibellines mutually deſtroying each other; whole ages of conſpiracies, and ſucceſſive irruptions of diſtant nations, who have paſſed the Alps, and driven each other from their ſettlements by turns, till at length, in all this beautiful and extenſive country, there remained only two ſtates of any conſideration governed by their own natives, *viz.* Venice and Rome. The others, namely Naples, Sicily, Milan, Parma, Placentia, and Tuſcany, are under the dominion of foreigners.

The other great ſtates of Chriſtendom have all of them ſuffered equally by wars, and inteſtine commotions; but none of them have been brought under ſubjection thereby to a neighbouring power. The reſult of theſe endleſs diſturbances and perpetual jars has been only the ſeparating of ſome ſmall provinces from one ſtate, to be transfered to another. Flanders, for example, which was the ancient peerdom of France, paſſed to the houſe of Burgundy from foreign hands, and from this houſe to that of Auſtria; and a ſmall part of this Flanders came again into the hands of the French in the reign of Lewis XIV. Several provinces of Ancient Gaul were in former times diſmembered. Alſace, which was a part of Ancient Gaul, came afterwards to belong to Germany, and is at this day a province of France. Upper Navarre,

which ſhould be a demeſne of the elder branch of the houſe of Bourbon, belongs to the younger; and Rouſſillon, which was formerly the Spaniard's, now belongs to the crown of France.

During all theſe ſhocks, there have been formed ſince the time of Charlemagne only two abſolutely independent republics, namely that of Switzerland and that of Holland.

No one great kingdom has been able to ſubdue another. France, notwithſtanding the conqueſts of Edward III. and Henry V. notwithſtanding the victories and efforts of Charles V. and Philip II. has ſtill preſerved its limits, and even extended them; Spain, Germany, Great Britain, Poland, and the northern ſtates, are nearly the ſame as they were formerly.

What then have been the fruits of the blood of ſo many millions of men, ſpilt in battle, and the ſacking of ſo many cities? Nothing great or conſiderable. The Chriſtian powers have loſt a great deal to the Turks, within theſe five centuries, and have gained ſcarcely any thing from each other.

All hiſtory then, in ſhort, is little elſe than a long ſucceſſion of uſeleſs cruelties; and if there happens any great revolution, it will bury the remembrance of all the paſt diſputes, wars, and fraudulent treaties, which have produced ſo many tranſitory miſeries.

In the number of theſe miſeries we may with juſtice include the diſturbances and civil wars on the ſcore of religion. Of theſe Europe has experienced two kinds, and it is hard to ſay which of them has proved moſt fatal to her. The firſt, as we have already ſeen, was the

was the diſpute of the popes with the emperors and kings: this began in the time of Lewis the Feeble, and was not entirely at an end, in Germany, till after the reign of Charles V. in England, till ſuppreſſed by the reſolution of queen Elizabeth, and in France, till the ſubmiſſion of Henry IV. The other ſource of ſo much bloodſhed, was the rage of dogmatizing. This has cauſed the ſubverſion of more than one ſtate, from the time of the maſſacre of the Albigenſes, to the thirteenth century, and from the ſmall war of the Cevennois, to the beginning of the eighteenth. The field and the ſcaffold ran with blood on account of theological arguments, ſometimes in one century, ſometimes in another, for almoſt five hundred years, without interruption; and the long continuance of this dreadful ſcourge was owing to this, that morality was always neglected, to indulge a ſpirit of dogmatizing.

It muſt therefore once again be acknowleged, that hiſtory in general is a collection of crimes, follies, and misfortunes, among which we have now and then met with a few virtues, and ſome happy times; as we ſometimes ſee a few ſcattered huts in a barren deſert.

In thoſe times of darkneſs and ignorance, which we diſtinguiſh by the name of the middle age, no one perhaps ever deſerved ſo well of mankind as pope Alexander VIII. It was he who aboliſhed vaſſalage, in a council which he held in the twelfth century. It was this ſame pontiff who triumphed in Venice by his prudence, over the brutal violence of the emperor Frederick Barbaroſſa, and who obliged Henry II. of England to aſk pardon of God and man

for the murder of Thomas Becket *. He reſtored the rights of the people, and chaſtiſed the wickedneſs of crowned heads. We have had occaſion to remark, that, before this æra, all Europe, a very ſmall number of cities excepted, was divided between two ranks of people; the lords, or owners of lands, either eccleſiaſtical or ſecular, and the villains, or ſlaves. The lawyers who aſſiſted the knights, bailiffs, and ſtewards of fiefs, in giving their ſentences, were in fact no other than bondmen, or villains, themſelves. And, if mankind at length enjoy their rights, it is to pope Alexander VIII. they are chiefly indebted for this happy change. It is to him that ſo many cities owe their preſent ſplendour; nevertheleſs, we know that this liberty was not univerſally extended. It has never made its way into Poland; the huſbandman there is ſtill a ſlave, and confined to the glebe; it is the ſame in Bohemia, Suabia, and ſeveral other countries of Germany; and even in France, in ſome of the provinces the moſt remote from the capital, we ſtill ſee remains of this ſlavery. There are ſome chapters and monks, who claim a right to all the goods of the peaſants.

In Aſia, on the contrary, there are no ſlaves

* That is to ſay, he obliged a great prince to do ſhameful penance, for a murder in which he had no concern; and by what means did he manifeſt this power? by employing all the villainous arts of prieſtcraft, to alienate the affections of the people from their natural ſovereign; by excommunications, interdictions, and abſolving the ſubjects from their oaths of allegiance. As for Becket, whom Alexander allowed to be canonized, we hope there are not three Britons, now living, who do not deteſt his character, as that of a pernicious fire-brand, whoſe pride, inſolence, and fanaticiſm kept his ſovereign and his country in continual diſquiet.

but thoſe which are purchaſed with money, or taken priſoners in battle. In the Chriſtian ſtates of Europe, they do not buy ſlaves, neither do they reduce their priſoners of war to a ſtate of ſervitude. The Aſiatics have only a domeſtic ſervitude; Chriſtians only a civil one. The peaſant in Poland is a bondman in the lands, but not in the houſe of his lord. We purchaſe houſhold-ſlaves only from the negroes; we are ſeverely reproached for this kind of traffic, but the people who make a trade of ſelling their children, are certainly more blameable than thoſe who purchaſe them, and this traffic is only a proof of our ſuperiority. He who voluntarily ſubjects himſelf to a maſter, is deſigned by nature for a ſlave *.

We have ſeen that, from time immemorial, they have tolerated all religions in Aſia, much in the ſame manner as it is at preſent done in England, Holland, and Germany. We have obſerved, that this toleration was more general in Japan than in any other country whatever, till the fatal affair which rendered that government ſo inexorable.

We may have obſerved, in the courſe of ſo many revolutions, that ſeveral nations, almoſt entirely ſavage, have been formed both in Europe and Aſia, in thoſe very countries which were formerly the moſt civilized. Thus, ſome of the iſlands of the Archipelago, which were once ſo flouriſhing, are now little better than Indian habitations in America. The country

* We apprehend that all the effects of all the people in France, or of any other arbitrary government, properly ſpeaking, belong to the crown; inaſmuch as the ſovereign can ſeize them at his pleaſure.

where formerly were the cities of Artaxates, Tigranocertes, and Colchos, are not now of half the value of ſome of our petty colonies. There are in ſome of the iſlands, foreſts, and mountains in the very heart of Europe, a ſet of people, who are in nothing ſuperior to thoſe of Canada, or the negroes of Africa. The Turks are more civilized, but we hardly know of one city built by them; they have ſuffered the moſt noble and beautiful monuments of antiquity to fall to decay, and reign only over a pile of ruins.

They have nothing in Aſia that in the leaſt reſembles our European nobility; nor is there to be found throughout the whole Eaſt any one order of citizens, diſtinguiſhed from the others by hereditary titles, or particular privileges and indulgencies, annexed ſolely to birth. The Tartars ſeem to be the only people who have ſome faint ſhadow of this inſtitution, in the race of their Mirzas. We meet with nothing either in Turky, Perſia, the Indies, or China, that bears any ſimilitude to that body of nobility which forms an eſſential part of every European monarchy. We muſt go as far as Malabar to meet with any likeneſs to this ſort of conſtitution; and there again it is very different, and conſiſts in a tribe wholly dedicated to bearing arms, and which never intermixes, by marriage or otherwiſe, with any of the other tribes or caſts, and will not even condeſcend to hold any commerce with them.

The greateſt difference between us and the Orientals, is in the manner of treating our women. No female ever reigned in the Eaſt, unleſs that princeſs of Mingrelia, whom Sir John Chardin tell us of in his voyages, and whom he

accuſes of robbing him. In France, tho' the women cannot wear the crown, they may be regents of the kingdom, and have a right to every other throne, but that of the empire and Poland.

Another difference, in our manner of treating women, is the cuſtom of placing about their perſons men deprived of their virility, a cuſtom which has always prevailed in Aſia and Africa, and has at times been introduced into Europe by the Roman emperors. At preſent there is not throughout all Chriſtendom two hundred eunuchs employed, either in our churches or theatres, whereas all the eaſtern ſeraglios ſwarm with them.

In ſhort, we differ in every reſpect, in religion, policy, government, manners, food, cloathing, and even in our manners of writing, expreſſing, and thinking. That in which we the moſt reſemble them is, that propenſity to war, ſlaughter, and deſtruction, which has always depopulated the face of the earth. It muſt be owned, however, that this rage has taken much leſs poſſeſſion of the minds of the people of India and China, than of ours. In particular, we have no inſtance of the Indians or Chineſe having made war upon the inhabitants of the North. In this reſpect they are much better members of ſociety than ourſelves; but then, on the other hand, this very virtue, or rather meekneſs, of theirs, has been their ruin; for they have been all enſlaved.

In the midſt of the ravages and deſolations which we have obſerved during the ſpace of nine hundred years, we perceive a love for order which ſecretly animates human kind, and has prevented its total ruin. This is one of

the ſprings of nature which always recovers its tone; it is this which has formed the code of all nations, and this inſpires a veneration for the laws and the miniſters of the laws at Tonquin, and in the iſland of Formoſa, the ſame as at Rome. Children reſpect their parents in all countries, and in every country (let others ſay what they will) the ſon is his father's heir; for, though in Turky the ſon of a Timariot does not inherit his father's dignity, nor, in India, the ſon of an Omra his lands; the reaſon is, becauſe neither the one nor the other belong to the father himſelf. A place for life is, in no country of the world, conſidered as an inheritance; but, in Perſia, in India, and throughout all Aſia, every native, and even every ſtranger, of whatſoever religion, except in Japan, may purchaſe lands that are not part of the crown demeſnes, and leave them to his family.

In our Europe, indeed, there are ſtill ſome nations, where the law will not ſuffer a ſtranger to purchaſe a field or burying-place in their territories. The barbarous right of Aubaine, by which a ſtranger beholds his father's eſtate go to the king's treaſury, ſtill ſubſiſts in all the Chriſtian ſtates, unleſs where it is otherwiſe provided by private convention.

We likewiſe have a notion, that in the eaſtern countries the women are all ſlaves, becauſe they are confined to the duties of domeſtic life. If they were really ſlaves, they muſt become beggars at the death of their huſbands, which is not the caſe; the law every where provides a ſtated portion for them, and this portion they obtain in caſe of a divorce. In every part of the world, we find laws eſtabliſhed for the ſupport of families.

In all nations there is a proper curb to arbitrary power, either by law, cuſtom, or manners. The Turkiſh ſultan can neither touch the public treaſure, break the Janiſſaries, nor interfere with the inſide of the ſeraglios of any of his ſubjects. The emperor of China cannot publiſh a ſingle edict, without the ſanction of a tribunal. Every ſtate is at times liable to violent oppreſſions; the grand vizirs and the Itimadoulets exerciſe rapine and murder, it is true, but they are no more authoriſed ſo to do by the laws, than the wild Arabs, or wandering Tartars, are to plunder the caravans.

Religion teaches the ſame principles of morality to all nations, without exception; the ceremonies of the Aſiatics are ridiculous, their belief abſurd, but their precepts are juſt; the derviſe, the faquir, the bonze, and the talopin, are always crying out, "Be juſt and beneficent." The common people in China are accuſed of being great cheats in trade; they are perhaps encouraged to this vice, by knowing that they can purchaſe abſolution for their crime of their bonzes, for a trifling piece of money. The moral precepts taught them are good, the indulgence which is ſold them is bad.

We are not to credit thoſe travellers and miſſionaries, who have repreſented the eaſtern prieſts to us as perſons who preach up iniquity; this is traducing human nature, it is not poſſible that there ſhould ever exiſt a religious ſociety, inſtituted for the encouragement or propagation of vice.

We ſhould equally deceive ourſelves, were we to believe, that the Mahometan religion owes its eſtabliſhment wholly to the ſword.

The Mahometans have had their miſſionaries in the Indies, and at China; and the ſects of Omar and Ali diſpute with each other for proſelytes, even on the coaſts of Coromandel and Malabar.

From all that we have obſerved in this ſketch of univerſal hiſtory, it follows, that whatever concerns human nature, is the ſame from one end of the univerſe to the other, and that what is dependant upon cuſtom differs, or, if there is any reſemblance, it is the effect of chance. The dominion of cuſtom is much more extenſive than that of nature, and influences all manners and all uſages. It diffuſes variety over the face of the univerſe. Nature eſtabliſhes unity, and every where ſettles a few invariable principles: the ſoil is ſtill the ſame, but culture produces various fruits.

As nature has placed in the heart of man, intereſt, pride, and all the paſſions, it is no wonder, that, during a period of about ſix centuries, we meet with almoſt a continual ſucceſſion of crimes and diſaſters. If we go back to earlier ages, we ſhall find them no better. Cuſtom has ordered it ſo, that evil has every where operated in a different manner.

CHAP. CCXII.

Of the POLITE ARTS in EUROPE, at the Time of LEWIS XIV.

I HAVE ſufficiently hinted, in the courſe of this hiſtory, that the public diſaſters it contains, and which ſucceed each other almoſt without intermiſſion, are at length eraſed from

the regiſters of time. The ſprings, and minuter circumſtances of politicks, ſink into oblivion; whilſt wiſe laws and inſtitutions, the monuments produced by the arts and ſciences, continue for ever.

Of the immenſe crowd of ſtrangers that now travel to Rome, not as pilgrims, but as perſons of taſte, hardly one is at the pains to enquire any thing concerning Gregory VII. or Boniface VIII. they admire the beautiful churches built by a Bramantes and a Michael Angelo, the paintings of a Raphael, and the ſculptures of a Bernini; if they have genius, they read the works of Arioſto and Taſſo, and reverence the aſhes of Galileo. In England the exploits of Cromwell are ſcarcely mentioned, and the diſputes of the white and red roſes are almoſt forgotten; but Newton is ſtudied for whole years together: no one is ſurpriſed to ſee in his epitaph, "That he was the glory of mankind;" but it would be matter of great wonder in that country, to ſee the remains of any ſtateſman honoured with ſuch a title.

I ſhould be glad, in this place, to do juſtice to all the great men, who, like him, were the ornaments of their country in the laſt century. I have called this the Age of Lewis XIV. not only becauſe this monarch patronized the arts much more than all the other kings, his cotemporaries, put together, but alſo, becauſe he ſaw all the generations of the princes of Europe thrice renewed. I have fixed this epoch ſome years before the time of Lewis XIV. and have carried it down ſome years after his deceaſe, as this was in fact the ſpace of time in which the human mind made the greateſt progreſs.

The Engliſh have made greater advances towards perfection, in almoſt every ſpecies of learning, from 1660 to the preſent time, than in all the preceding ages. I ſhall not here repeat what I have elſewhere ſaid, of Milton. It is true, he is accuſed by ſeveral critics of a whimſical extravagance in his deſcriptions, ſuch as that of the fools paradiſe; the walls of alabaſter with which the garden of Eden was ſurrounded; the devils, who transformed themſelves from giants to pigmies, to take up leſs room in the council-chamber of hell, built all of pure gold; the firing of cannon in heaven; the hills that the combatants flung at each other's heads; angels on horſeback, and angels whoſe bodies, after being cut aſunder, unite again. He is complained of for his prolixity and inceſſant repetitions. They ſay he neither equals Ovid nor Heſiod, in that long deſcription of the formation of the earth, animals, and man. His diſſertations on aſtronomy are cenſured, as being too dry and unintereſting; his invention thought rather extravagant than wonderful, and more diſguſtful than ſtriking; for inſtance, the long cauſeway over chaos; ſin and death enamoured of each other, and having children by their inceſtuous commerce; "Death, who liſts up his noſe, to ſnuff, through the immenſity of chaos, the change which has befel the earth, as a raven ſmells dead carcaſes." The ſame Death who ſmells out ſin, who ſtrikes with his petrifying club on the elements of Earth and Water, who, together with Heat and Humidity, becoming four valiant generals of an army, leading in battle-array the light-armed embrios of atoms. In ſhort, writers have exhauſted themſelves in criticiſms on this celebrated work; but

there can be no end to the praiſes it merits. Milton will ever continue the boaſt and admiration of the Engliſh nation, will always be compared to Homer, whoſe faults are equally great, and always preferred to Dante, whoſe imagination is even more extravagant.

Among the great number of pleaſing poets that adorned the reign of Charles II. ſuch as Waller, the earls of Dorſet and Roſcommon, the duke of Buckingham, *&c.* the celebrated Dryden holds a diſtinguiſhed place: he is equally famous in all the different ſpecies of poetry. His writings abound with a number of minute particulars, at once natural and lively, animated, bold, nervous, and pathetic; a merit in which he has been equalled by no other poet of his nation, nor exceeded by any one among the ancients. If Pope, who came after him, had not, in the latter part of his life, written his Eſſay on Man, he would have fallen far ſhort of Dryden.

No nation has ever treated morality, in verſe, with ſo much energy and depth, as the Engliſh. In this I think ſeems to lie the greateſt merit of their poets.

There is another kind of varied literature, which requires a ſtill more cultivated and univerſal genius; this Addiſon poſſeſſed in an eminent degree. He has not only immortalized his name by his Cato, which is the only Engliſh tragedy written with elegance and well ſupported dignity, but his other writings, both moral and critical, breathe the very ſoul of good taſte; here ſenſe is every where embelliſhed with the flowers of imagination; and his manner of writing may ſerve as a model to all na-

tions. There are ſeveral little pieces of Dean Swift, unmatched by any thing of the kind in antiquity. He is Rabelais improved.

The Engliſh are not acquainted with funeral orations, it not being the cuſtom with them to praiſe their kings and queens in their churches, but pulpit-eloquence, which, before the reign of Charles II. was very rude, became formed on a ſudden. Biſhop Burnet acknowleges, that this was owing to their imitation of the French; perhaps they have even ſurpaſſed their maſters; they are not ſo ſtiff, affected, and declamatory in their ſermons, as the French are.

It is alſo very remarkable that theſe iſlanders, who are ſeparated from the reſt of the world, and who remained ſo long untaught, ſhould have acquired at leaſt as much knowlege of antiquity as is to be met with at Rome, though the center of all nations. Maſham has unveiled the dark accounts of ancient Egypt; no Perſian had ever a more perfect knowlege of the religion of Zoroaſter, than the celebrated Hyde. The hiſtory of Mahomet, and the times preceding him, which was unknown to the Turks, has been fully illuſtrated by Hales, who made ſo many uſeful voyages to Arabia.

There is no country in the world, where the Chriſtian religion has been ſo ſtrongly attacked, and ſo learnedly defended, as in England. From the time of Henry VIII. to that of Cromwell, they carried on their diſputes like the antient gladiators, who were wont to come into the arena to fight, with a ſcymetar in their hand, and a bandage about their eyes. Some ſlight differences in doctrine and worſhip, were productive of the moſt bloody wars; whereas, ſince the reſtoration to the preſent time, tho'

ſcarce a year has paſſed without ſome attack upon Chriſtianity, the controverſy has not excited the leaſt diſturbance; learning being the only weapon now employed on either ſide, inſtead of fire and ſword, as formerly.

But, it is in philoſophy that the Engliſh have particularly had the maſtery over all other nations. Ingenious and ſpeculative notions were out of the queſtion. The fables of the Greeks had been long laid aſide, and thoſe of the moderns were to appear no more. Chancellor Bacon firſt led the way, by aſſerting that we ſhould ſearch into nature in a new manner, and have recourſe to experiments. Boyle employed his whole life in making them. This is no place for diſcuſſions on natural philoſophy; let it ſuffice to ſay, that, after three thouſand years of vain enquiries, Newton was the firſt who diſcovered and demonſtrated the great law of nature, by which every part of matter tends towards the center, and all the planets are retained in their proper courſe. He was the firſt who truly beheld light; before him we knew not what it was.

His principles of the mathematics, which contain a ſyſtem of natural philoſophy, entirely new and true, are founded on the diſcovery of what is called the Calculation of Infinites, the laſt effect of geometry, and which was executed by him at the age of twenty-four. This occaſioned that great philoſopher, the learned Halley, to ſay, "That it will never be permitted any mortal to approach nearer to the Deity."

Numberleſs good geometricians and natural philoſophers were at once improved by his diſcoveries, and encouraged to purſue the tract he had pointed out to them. Bradley at length

went ſo far as to diſcover the parallax of the fixed ſtars, at twelve millions of millions of miles diſtant from our little globe.

The ſame Halley whom I have juſt mentioned, though no more than a private aſtronomer, had the command of one of the king's ſhips in the year 1698. In this ſhip he determined the poſition of the ſtars of the Antarctic, or South Pole, and marked the different variations of the compaſs in all the parts of the known world. The famous voyage of the Argonauts was, in compariſon with his, no more than the paſſing from one ſide of a river to another in a boat; and yet this voyage of Halley's has ſcarcely been ſpoken of in Europe.

This indifference of ours for great things, when become too familiar, and the admiration paid by the ancient Greeks to the moſt trivial ones, is another proof of the prodigious ſuperiority of our age over the ancient times. Boileau in France, and Sir William Temple in England, obſtinately deny any ſuch ſuperiority; they ſeem reſolved to depreciate their own age, in order to exalt themſelves above it. This diſpute between the ancients and moderns is at length decided, at leaſt as to philoſophy. There is not one of the ancient philoſophers, whoſe works are now made uſe of for the inſtruction of youth, in any of the enlightned nations.

Locke alone might ſerve as a great inſtance of the advantage that the preſent time has over the fineſt ages of Greece. From Plato, down to him, there is one great chaſm, no one during all that interval having explained the operations of the ſoul; and a perſon who ſhould be acquainted with all that Plato has wrote, and ac-

quainted only with that, would have very little knowlege, and even that erroneous.

The Greek was indeed an eloquent writer; his apology for Socrates is a great piece of ſervice done to the learned of all nations. It is but juſt to hold him in veneration, who made oppreſſed virtue ſo venerable, and its perſecutors ſo deteſtable. It was for a long time thought that he, who was ſo fine a moraliſt, could not be a bad natural philoſopher; he was held almoſt for a father of the church, on account of his Ternarion, which no one underſtood; but what would be thought of a philoſopher in our days, who ſhould tell us that matter is the author; and that the world is a figure of twelve pentagons? that fire is a pyramid, and is linked to the earth by numbers? How would a perſon be received, who ſhould go about to prove the immortality and metampſycoſis of the ſoul, by ſaying, that ſleep comes from watching, watching from ſleep, life from death, and death from life? Yet ſuch are the arguments that have been the admiration of ſo many ages, and ideas ſtill more extravagant have ſince continued to be made uſe of, in the education of mankind.

Locke is the only one who has explained Human Underſtanding, in a book where there are nothing but truths; and what renders the work perfect is, that theſe truths are all clear.

If we would, once for all, ſee in what this laſt age has the ſuperiority over the former ones, we have only to caſt our eyes upon Germany, and the North. Dantzick has produced an Hevelius, who is the firſt aſtronomer that was ever well acquainted with the planet of the moon, no man before him having ever ſo carefully examined the heavens; among the many great

men whom this age has produced, no one is a more ſtriking example how juſtly it may be called the age of Lewis XIV. Hevelius loſt an immenſe library by fire. The French monarch recompenſed the aſtronomer, with a preſent that far overpaid his loſs.

In Holſtein, Mercator was the forerunner of Newton in geometry. The Bernouilli of Switzerland, were diſciples worthy this great man, and Leibnitz was for ſome time conſidered as his rival.

The famous Leibnitz was born at Leipſick: he ended his days in Hanover, like a true philoſopher, believing in a God, like Newton, without conſulting the various opinions of mankind. He was perhaps a man of the moſt univerſal learning in Europe; he was an hiſtorian indefatigable in his enquiries; a profound civilian, who enlightened the ſtudy of the law by philoſophy, foreign as it may appear to that kind of ſtudy; ſo thorough a metaphyſician, as to attempt reconciling divinity and the metaphyſics; a tolerable Latin poet; and laſtly, ſo good a mathematician, as to diſpute with the great Newton the invention of the calculation of infinites, and to make it for ſome time doubted, which of them had the juſteſt claim to the honour of that diſcovery.

This was then the golden age of geometry. Mathematicians ſent frequent challenges to each other, that is to ſay, problems to ſolve, much in the ſame manner as it is ſaid the ancient kings of Egypt and Aſia, ſent ænigmas to be anſwered by one another. The problems propoſed by theſe geometricians were of a much more difficult nature than the Egyptian ænigmas, and yet none of them remained unan-

ſwered, either in Germany, England, Italy, or France. There never was a more univerſal correſpondence kept between philoſophers than at this period, and Leibnitz contributed not a little to encourage it. A republic of letters was inſenſibly eſtabliſhed in Europe, in the midſt of the moſt obſtinate war, and the number of different religions; the arts and ſciences, all of them thus received mutual aſſiſtance from each other, and the academies helped to form this republic. Italy and Ruſſia were united by the bonds of ſcience, and the natives of England, Germany, and France, went to ſtudy at Leyden. The famous phyſician Boerhaave was conſulted at the ſame time by the pope and the czar of Muſcovy. His principal pupils have in like manner drawn ſtrangers after them, and are in ſome meaſure become the phyſicians of nations. The truly learned of every denomination have ſtrengthened the bands of this grand ſociety of geniuſes, which is univerſally diffuſed, and every where independent. This correſpondence is ſtill carried on, and proves one of the greateſt comforts againſt the evils which ambition and politics ſcatter through the world.

Italy has preſerved her ancient glory in this age, though ſhe has produced no new Taſſos nor Raphaels. It is ſufficient that ſhe has once produced them. A Cabrera, a Zappi, and a Filicaia, have ſhewn that delicacy is always the portion of this nation. The Merope of Maffei, and the dramatic works of Metaſtaſio, are the beautiful monuments of the age.

The ſtudy of true natural philoſophy, as eſtabliſhed by Galileo, ſtill keeps its ground in ſpite of the ancient philoſophy, which has but

too

too many bigotted admirers. The Caſſinis, the Vivianis, the Mandis, the Bianchinis, the Zanottis, and many others, have ſpread over Italy the ſame light which beamed in other countries, and, though its principal rays came from England, yet the Italian ſchools have been able to gaze on it in all its ſplendour.

Every kind of literature has been cultivated in this ancient ſeat of the arts as much as elſewhere, except in thoſe ſubjects where a liberty of thinking allows a greater ſcope to the genius in other nations. This age in particular has attained a better knowlege of antiquity than the preceding. Italy furniſhes more monuments than all Europe together, and in proportion as theſe have been brought to light, ſcience has become more extenſive.

We are indebted for this progreſs to ſome wiſe men and geniuſes, ſcattered in a ſmall number over ſome parts of Europe, almoſt all of them for a long time ſubjected to perſecutions, and loſt in oblivion; they have enlightened and comforted the world during the wars that ſpread deſolation through it. There are liſts to be met with elſewhere, of all thoſe who have been the ornaments of Germany, England, and Italy. It would be very improper, in a ſtranger, to pretend to rate the merits of ſo many illuſtrious men; let it ſuffice then to have ſhewn, that in the laſt age mankind acquired throughout Europe greater lights, than in all the ages that preceded it.

CHAP.

CHAP. CCXIII.

A Liſt of the Children of LEWIS XIV. The SOVEREIGN PRINCES cotemporary with him. His GENERALS and MINISTERS.

The Children of Lewis XIV.

HE married Maria Thereſa of Auſtria, born in 1638, only daughter to Philip IV. by his firſt queen Elizabeth of France, and ſiſter to Charles II. and Margaret Thereſa, whom Philip IV. had by his ſecond wife Maria Anne of Auſtria. The nuptials of Lewis XIV. were celebrated the ninth day of July 1660, and Maria Thereſa died in 1683. He had by her,

Lewis the dauphin called Monſeigneur, born Nov. 1, 1661, who died at Meudon April 14, 1711. Nothing was more common for a conſiderable time before the death of this prince than the following proverb which was applied to him: "The ſon of a king, the father of a king, and never king." The event ſeemed to countenance the credulity of thoſe who place faith in predictions; but this ſaying was only a repetition of that which went about concerning Philip of Valois, and was moreover founded chiefly on Lewis XIV's own ſtate of health, who was much more robuſt than his ſon. This prince had by Mary-Anne-Chriſtiana-Victoria of Bavaria, who died the 20th of April, 1690.

1. Lewis Duke of Burgundy, who was born Auguſt 6, 1682, and died Feb. 18, 1712. He had iſſue by his dutcheſs, Maria Adelaide of Savoy, who died Feb. 12, 1712, N. duke of Bri-

Brittany, who died in 1705; Lewis duke of Brittany, who died in 1712; and Lewis XV. who was born Feb. 15, 1710.

2. Philip, duke of Anjou, king of Spain, born Dec. 19, 1683, died July 9, 1746.

3. Charles, duke of Berry, born Aug. 31, 1686, died May 4, 1714.

Lewis XIV. had two other ſons and three daughters, who all died young.

His natural and legitimated Children.

Lewis XIV. had by the dutcheſs of la Valliere, who turned carmelite nun June 2, 1674, took the habit June 4, 1675, and died June 6, 1710, aged 65.

Lewis of Bourbon, count of Vermandois, born Oct. 2, 1667, died in 1683.

Mary-Anne, called Mademoiſelle de Blois, born in 1666, was married to Armand prince of Conti, and died in 1739.

Other natural and legitimated Children.

Lewis-Auguſtus of Bourbon, duke of Main, born March 31, 1670, died in 1736.

Lewis-Cæſar, count of Vexin, abbot of St. Dennis and St. Germain des Prés, born in 1672, died in 1683.

Lewis-Alexander of Bourbon, count of Toulouſe, born June 6, 1678, died in 1737.

Louiſa-Frances of Bourbon, called Mademoiſelle de Nantes, born in 1673, was married to Lewis III. duke of Bourbon-Condé, and died in 1743.

Louiſa-Maria of Bourbon, called Mademoiſelle de Tours, died in 1681.

Frances

Frances-Mary, of Bourbon, called Mademoiſelle de Blois, born in 1677, was married to Philip II. duke of Orleans, regent of France, died in 1749.

Two other ſons who both died young.

Cotemporary Princes.

POPES.

Barberini Urban VIII. died in	1644

It was he who firſt gave the title of *eminence* to the cardinals.

Pamfilo Innocent X.	1655
Chigi Alexander VII.	1667
Roſpigliosi Clement IX.	1669
Altieri Clement X.	1676
Odeſcalchi Innocent XI.	1689
Ottoboni Alexander VIII.	1691
Pignatelli Innocent XII.	1700
Albani Clement XI.	1721

The Ottoman Houſe.

Ibrahim died in	1655
Mahomet IV.	1687
Soliman III.	1691
Achmet II.	1695
Muſtapha II.	1703
Achmet III. depoſed in	1730

Emperors of Germany.

Ferdinand III. died in	1657
Leopold I.	1705
Joſeph I.	1711
Charles VI.	1740

Kings of Spain.

Philip IV. died in	1665
Charles II.	1700
Philip V.	1746

Kings of Portugal.

John IV. duke of Braganza, died in	1656
Alphonſo-Henry, dethroned in 1667	1683
Peter II.	1706
John V.	1750

Kings of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

Charles I. beheaded in	1649
Charles II. died in	1685
James II. dethroned in 1688	1701
William III.	1702
Anne Stuart	1714
George I.	1727

Kings of Denmark.

Chriſtian IV. died in	1648
Frederick III.	1670
Chriſtian V.	1699
Frederick IV.	1730

Kings of Sweden.

Chriſtina abdicated in 1654, died in	1689
Charles-Guſtavus	1660
Charles XI.	1697
Charles XII.	1718

Kings

Kings of Poland.

Ladiſlaus Sigiſmond died in	1648
John Caſimir abdicated	1667
Michael Wieſnowiſki died in	1673
John Sobieſki	1696
Frederick-Auguſtus, elector of Saxony	1733
Staniſlaus	

Kings of Pruſſia.

Frederick I. died in	1713
Frederick-William	1740

Czars.

Michael-Foederowitz died in	1645
Alexis-Michælowitz	1676
Foedor-Alexiowitz	1682
Iwan-Alexiowitz	1688
Peter-Alexiowitz.	1725

Marſhals of France, who either died in the reign of Lewis XIV. or ſerved under him.

D'Albret (Cœſar-Phœbus) of the royal houſe of Navarre, made marſhal of France in 1653: notwithſtanding his high deſcent, he made no ſcruple to marry the daughter of Guénegaud, the king's treaſurer, a young lady of great merit. He died in 1676.

D'Alegre (Yves) who ſerved in the armies of Lewis XIV. near ſixty years before he was made marſhal of France in 1724. He died in 1733.

D'Asfeldt (Claud-Francis-Bidal). He acquired great reputation in the art of attacking and de-

defending places. He was made marſhal of France in 1734.

D'Aubuſſon (Francis de la Feuillade), made marſhal in 1675, the ſame who out of gratitude erected the ſtatue of Lewis XIV. in the Square des Victoires. He died in 1691. His ſon was not made marſhal till a long time after his death, viz. in 1725.

D'Aumont (Anthony), grandſon to the famous John Marſhal d'Aumont, one of Henry IV's great generals. Anthony was greatly inſtrumental in gaining the battle of Rhetel in 1650. He had the marſhal's ſtaff given him as a reward. He died in 1669.

De Balincourt, made marſhal in 1746.

Berwick (James Fitz-James duke of), natural ſon to James II. king of England, by a ſiſter of the duke of Marlborough. He was created duke of Berwick in England by his father. He was likewiſe a duke of Spain and of France: he was made marſhal in 1706, and was killed at the ſiege of Philipſburg in 1734.

Baſſompiere (Francis de) born in 1579, a man well known in the world; but few people know that he cauſed the ditch in the queen's courſe to be lined with ſtone at his own expence. He was made marſhal in 1622, and died in 1646.

Bellefonds (*Bernardine, Gigaul de*), made marſhal in 1668, died in 1694.

De Belle-Isle (Lewis Charles Auguſtus de Fouquet) diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the war of 1710, is a duke and peer of France, and a prince of the empire, made marſhal in 1741.

Bezons (James Bazin de) made marſhal in 1709, died in 1733.

Biron

Biron. (Armand Charles de Goutaut, duke of) He revived the ducal dignity in his houſe. Though he ſerved in all the wars of Lewis XIV. and loſt an arm at the ſiege of Landau, he was not made marſhal till the year 1734.

Boufflers (Lewis Francis duke of) made marſhal in 1693, died in 1711.

Du Bourg, (Eleonor Maria du Maine, count) gained an important battle under Lewis XIV. but was not made marſhal till 1725, and died the ſame year.

Brancas, (Henry de Villars de Séreſt) after having ſerved Lewis XIV. for a great number of years, was at length made marſhal in 1734.

Brezé, (Urban de Maillé, marquis of) brother-in-law to cardinal Richelieu, was made marſhal in 1632, afterwards viceroy of Catalonia, and died in 1650.

Broglio (Victor Mauritius) ſerved in all the wars of Lewis XIV. and was at length made marſhal in 1724, died in 1727.

Broglio (Francis-Mary, duke of) ſon to the former, one of the beſt lieutenant-generals in the wars of Lewis XIV. was made marſhal in 1734.

Caſtelnau (James de) made marſhal in 1658, mortally wounded the ſame year at the ſiege of Calais.

Catinat (Nicholas de) made marſhal in 1693. He blended the talents of the philoſopher with thoſe of the ſoldier. In the laſt battle in which he commanded, he gave for the word, Paris and St. Gaſſian, which latter was the name of his country ſeat, whither he retired

and died like a philoſopher, (after having refuſed the blue ribbon,) in 1712.

Chamilli. (Noël Bouton de) He was preſent at the ſiege of Candia, was made marſhal in 1703, and died in 1715.

Chateau-Renaud (Francis-Lewis Rouſſelet de) vice-admiral of France, a great ſea-officer, was made marſhal in 1703, died in 1716.

Chaulnes (Honorius d'Albre, duke of) made marſhal in 1620, died in 1649.

Choiſeul (Claude de) the third marſhal of France of that name, received the ſtaff in 1698, died in 1711.

Clairambault (Philip Palluau de) made marſhal in 1653, died in 1665.

De Clermont-Tonnerre ſerved in the war of 1701, but was not made marſhal till 1747.

Coigni (Francis de Franquelot) was a long time a general officer under Lewis XIV. was made marſhal in 1734. He gained two battles in Italy.

Coligni, (Gaſpard de) grandſon to the admiral of that name. He was made marſhal in 1622, and was killed at the head of the rebel army, under the count de Soiſſons, at Marfée, in 1646.

Crequi (Francis de) made marſhal in 1668. He had the reputation of being the moſt proper officer to ſucceed marſhal Turenne. He died in 1687.

D'Eſtampes (James de la Ferté-Imbaut) made marſhal in 1651, died in 1668.

D'Etrées (Francis Hannibal, duke) made marſhal in 1626. It is very remarkable that at the age of ninety-three he was married to his ſecond wife, Mademoiſelle de Manican, who miſcarried by

by him. He died in 1670, aged upwards of an hundred.

D'Etrées (John) made vice-admiral of France in 1670, and marſhal in 1681. He died in 1707.

D'Etrées (Victor-Maria) ſon to John D'Etrées, was like his father vice-admiral of France before he was marſhal. It is remarkable that he commanded in this quality the combined fleets of France and Spain in 1701, was made marſhal in 1703, and died in 1707.

Duras (James Henry de Durfort de) nephew to the viſcount of Turenne, was made marſhal in 1675, immediately after the death of his uncle, died in 1704.

Duras (John de Durfort, duke of) made field marſhal by Lewis XIV. and marſhal of France in 1741.

Fabert (Abraham) made marſhal in 1658. People have been determined to aſcribe his fortunes and death to ſupernatural cauſes; whereas there was nothing extraordinary in him but that he made his fortune entirely by his own merit, and that he refuſed the ribbon of the order; notwithſtanding that they would have diſpenſed with his giving the requiſite proofs: he died in 1662.

Fare (de la) ſon to the marquis de la Fare, ſo famous for his pleaſing poetical writings. He was an officer in 1701, and marſhal in 1746.

Ferté-Senneterre (Henry, duke of la) made marſhal in 1651, died in 1681.

Force (James Nompar de Caumont de la) made marſhal 1622. The ſame who eſcaped the great maſſacre of St. Bartholomew, and who has given an account of that affair in his me-

moirs, which are ſtill preſerved in the family. He died in 1652, at the age of 97.

Foucault (Lewis) count of Daugnon, made marſhal in 1653, died in 1659.

Gaſſion (John de) was bred up under the great Guſtavus, made marſhal in 1643. He was a Calviniſt by religion. He would never marry, ſaying, that he ſet too little value upon life to ſhare it with any one. He was killed at the ſiege of Lens in 1647.

Gramont (Anthony de) made marſhal in 1641, died in 1678.

Gramont (Anthony de) grandſon to the former, made marſhal in 1724. He was father to the duke of Gramont, who was killed at the battle of Fontenoi. He died in 1725.

Grancei (James Rouxel, count of) made marſhal in 1651, died in 1680.

Guebriant (John-Baptiſt de Budes) made marſhal in 1642, one of the moſt famous ſoldiers of his time. He was killed in 1643, at the ſiege of Rotweil, and interred with great funeral pomp in the church of Nôtre-Dame.

Harcourt (Henry, duke of) made marſhal in 1703, died in 1718. His ſon has ſince been made a marſhal in 1746.

Hocquincourt (Charles de Mouchi) made marſhal in 1651, was killed in the ſervice of the enemy before Dunkirk in 1658.

Hopital (Nicholas de l') captain of the guards of Lewis XIII. made marſhal in 1617 for killing marſhal d'Ancre. But he was deſerving of that dignity beſides by many noble actions. We reckon him among the marſhals of this age, becauſe he died under the reign of Lewis XIV. in 1644.

Hu-

Humieres (Lewis de Crevan, marquis of) made marſhal in 1668, died in 1694.

Joyeuſe (John-Armand de) made marſhal of France in 1693, died in 1710.

D'Eſenghein, an officer under Lewis XIV. made marſhal in 1741.

Lorge, (Guy Alphonſo de Durfort de) nephew to the viſcount of Turenne, made marſhal in 1676, died in 1702.

Luxembourg (Francis-Henry de Montmorenci, duke of) was bred up under the great Condé, made marſhal in 1675. There have been ſeven marſhals of France of this name, excluſive of conſtables; and there has not been a reign ſince the eleventh century without ſome perſon of this family at the head of the armies. He died in 1695.

Luxembourg (Chriſtian-Lewis de Montmorenci) ſon to the former. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the war of 1701, was made a marſhal in 1747.

Maillebois, ſon to the miniſter of ſtate Deſmarêts, having diſtinguiſhed himſelf on every occaſion ſince the war of 1701, he was made marſhal in 1741.

Marſin or *Marchin* (Ferdinand count of) having left the ſervice of the houſe of Auſtria for that of France, he was made marſhal in 1703, and died at Turin in 1706.

De Matignon (Charles-Auguſtus Goion de Gacé) made marſhal in 1708, died in 1729.

Maulevrier-Langeron, made marſhal, 1745.

Medavi (James Leonor Rouxel de Grancei, count of) was not made marſhal till the year 1724, though he gained a complete victory in 1706. He died in 1725.

De la Meilleraie (Charles de la Porte) was made marſhal in 1639, in the reign of Lewis XIII. who preſented him with the marſhal's ſtaff, on the breach of the city of Hedin. He was grand-maſter of the ordnance; and had the character of being the beſt officer in France for the conduct of a ſiege. He died in 1664.

Monteſquiou (Peter, count of Artagnan) made marſhal in 1709, died in 1725.

Montrevel (Nicholas Auguſtus de la Baume) made marſhal in 1703, died in 1716.

Mote-Houdancourt (Philip de la) made marſhal in 1642, and confined in the caſtle of Pierre-en-Ceſe, in 1643. It is obſervable, that there was not one general during the adminiſtrations of Richelieu and Mazarin, but that were either baniſhed or impriſoned. He died in 1657. His grandſon was made a marſhal in 1747.

Nangis, (Lewis Armand de Brichanteau.) He ſerved with reputation under marſhal Villars, in the war of 1701, and was made a marſhal himſelf by Lewis XV.

Navailles (Philip de Montaud de Bénac, duke of) made marſhal in 1675. Commanded at Candia, under the duke of Beaufort, and ſucceeded him at his death. He died in 1684.

Noailles (Anne Julius, duke of) made marſhal in 1693. He ſignalized himſelf in Spain, where he gained the battle of Ter. He died in 1708.

Noailles (Adrian Maurice) ſon to the former, was made general and commander in chief in Rouſſillon in 1706, and grandee of Spain, after having taken Gironne. He was not made marſhal of France till 1734. He had the direction of

of the finances in 1715; and has ſince been miniſter of ſtate.

Pleſſis-Pralin (Cæſar, duke of Choiſeul, count of) made marſhal in 1645. He had the honour of beating the viſcount of Turenne, at Rhetel, in 1650. He died in 1675.

Puiſegur (James de Chaſtenet de) made marſhal in 1734, ſon to James Puiſegur, lieutenant-general, under Lewis XIII. and Lewis XIV. who gained great reputation, and left a volume of memoirs. The marſhal himſelf has written upon war. He was a perſon conſulted by the miniſtry upon all critical occaſions.

Richelieu (Lewis Francis Armand du Pleſſis, duke of,) a brigadier under Lewis XIV. general and commander in chief at Genoa, made marſhal in 1748, took the iſland of Minorca from the Engliſh in 1756.

Rochefort (Henry Lewis, marquis of Alongni, and marquis of) made marſhal in 1675; died in 1676.

Requelaure (Anthony Gaſton John Baptiſt, duke of) made marſhal in 1724.

Roſen (Conrad de) general to James II. in Ireland, made marſhal in 1703, died in 1715.

Saint-Luc (Timoleon d'Epinai de) ſon to the valiant Saint-Luc, whoſe panegyric is to be found in Brantome. He was made marſhal in 1628, died in 1644.

Schomberg (Frederick Armand) was bred up under Frederick Henry, prince of Orange, made marſhal in 1675, duke of Mertola in Portugal, governor and generaliſſimo of Pruſſia, duke and general in England. He was a zealous proteſtant, and quitted France upon the re-

revocation of the edict of Nantz. He was killed at the battle of the Boyne in 1690.

Schulembourg (John de) count of Mondejeau, a native of Pruſſia, made marſhal in 1658; died in 1671.

Tallard (Camillus d'Oſtun, duke of). He concluded the two Treaties of Partition, was made marſhal of France in 1703, miniſter of ſtate in 1726, and died in 1728.

Teſſé (René de Frouillai) made marſhal in 1703, died in 1725.

Turenne (Henry de la Tour, viſcount of) born in 1611, made marſhal of France in 1644, field-marſhal-general in 1660; died in 1675.

Vauban (Sebaſtian le Prêtre, marquis of) made marſhal in 1703, died in 1707.

Villars (Lewis Claudio, duke of) who took the name of Hector, made marſhal in 1702, preſident of the council of war in 1718, repreſented the conſtable of France at the coronation of Lewis XV. in 1722, and died in 1734.

Villeroi (Nicholas de Nieuville, duke of) governor to Lewis XIV. 1646, made marſhal the ſame year, and died in 1685.

Villeroi (Francis de Nieuville, duke of) ſon to the former, governor to Lewis XV. made marſhal in 1693. His father and himſelf were chiefs of the council of the finances; a title without office, but which gave them a right to a ſeat in the king's council. He died in 1730.

Vivonne (Lewis-Victor de Rochechouart, duke of) gonfalonier, or great ſtandard-bearer to the church, general of the gallies, viceroy of Meſſina, and marſhal of France in 1675. He is not reckoned the principal marſhal of the navy,

as

as he ſerved a conſiderable time by land. He died in 1688.

D'Uxelles (Nicholas Chalon du Blé, marquis) made marſhal in 1703, and preſident of the council for foreign affairs in 1718. He died in 1730.

Great Admirals of France in the Reign of Lewis XIV.

Armand de Maillé, marquis of Brezé, made grand-maſter, chief, and ſuperintendant-general of navigation and commerce, in France, in 1643; was killed at ſea by a cannon-ball, June 14, 1646.

Anne of Auſtria, queen-regent of France, ſuperintendant of the French ſeas in 1646, reſigned in 1650.

Cæſar, duke of Vendome, and of Beaufort, made grand-maſter and ſuperintendant-general of navigation and commerce in France in 1650.

Francis de Vendome, duke of Beaufort, ſon to Cæſar, was killed at the battle of Candy, June 25, 1679.

Lewis of Bourbon, count of Vermandois, legitimated ſon of France, made admiral in the month of Auguſt 1669, when only two years of age; died in 1683.

Lewis Alexander of Bourbon, legitimated ſon of France, count of Toulouſe; made admiral in 1683, died in 1737.

Generals of the Galleys of France.

Armand, John du Pleſſis, duke of Richelieu, peer of France, made in 1643, during the life-

time of Francis his father, reſigned this poſt in 1661, and was ſucceeded by

Francis, marquis of Crequy, who likewiſe reſigned in 1669, a year after being named marſhal of France.

Lewis Victor de Rochechouart, count and afterwards duke of Vivonne, prince of Tonnai-Charente; made in 1669.

Lewis de Rochechouart, duke of Mortemar, in reverſion from his father, died April 3, 1688.

Lewis-Auguſtus of Bourbon, legitimated ſon of France, prince of Dombes, duke of Maine and Aumale; made in 1688, reſigned in 1694.

Lewis Joſeph, duke of Vendome, made in 1694, died in 1712.

René, Sire de Frouillai, count of Teſſé, made marſhal of France in 1712, and reſigned in 1716.

The chevalier D'Orleans, made in 1716, died in 1748. Since his death, this dignity has been united to the Admiralty.

Chancellors.

Charles de L'Aubepine, de Chateauneuf, keeper of the ſeals, died in	1653
Peter Seguier	1672
Matthew Molé, keeper of the ſeals	1656
Stephen D'Aligre	1677
Michael le Tellier	1685
Lewis Boucherat	1699
Lewis Phelipeaux de Pontchartrain, died in 1727, continued in office till	1714
Daniel Francis Voiſin	1717

Miniſters.

Julius Mazarin, cardinal, prime-miniſter, died in	1661

Superintendants of the Finances.

Cl. Bouthillier, died in	1651
Abel Servien	1659
Cl. de Meſmes, count D'Avaux	1650
Nicholas Bailleul	1652
Charles de la Nieuville	1653
Emeri, (his name was Michael Perticelli)	
René de Longuiel de Maiſons	1677
Nicholas Fouquet *.	1680

Secretaries of State.

Henry-Auguſtus de Lomenie de Brienne, died in	1666
Cl. Bouthillier, ſuperintendant of the finances	1651
Lewis Phelipeaux de la Vrilliere	1681
Abel Servien, ſuperintendant of the finances	1659
Leon Bouthillier de Chavigni	1652
Fr. Sublet des Noyers, ſuperintendant of the buildings	1645
H. de Guenegaud de Planci	1676
Michael le Tellier, chancellor	1685
Lewis Phelipeaux de la Vrilliere, reſigned in	1669
Hugh de Lionne	1671
Henry Lewis de Lomenie de Brienne	1683
John Baptiſt Colbert, comptroller-general	1683
John Baptiſt Colbert de Seignelai	1690

† When this man was arreſted, the office of ſuperintendant of the finances was ſuppreſſed.

Fr. Michael le Tellier de Louvois	1691
Ch. Colbert de Croiffi	1696
Simon Arnauld de Pompone	1699
Baltheazar Phelipeaux de Chateauneuf	1700
Lewis Francis Mary le Tellier de Barbefieux	1701
Lewis Phelipeaux de Pontchartrain, chancellor	1727
Dan. Fr. Voiſin, chancellor	1717
Lewis Phelipeaux de la Vrilliere	1725
Michael Chamillard, comptroller-general of the finances	1721
Jerom Phelipeaux de Pontchartrain, reſigned in 1715, died in	1747
John Baptiſt Colbert de Torci	1746

CHAP.

CHAP. CCXIV.

A CATALOGUE of moſt of the French Writers who flouriſhed in the Age of Lewis XIV. to ſerve towards the Literary Hiſtory of that Age.

ABadie (James) was born in Bearn in 1558. He was celebrated for his Treatiſe upon the Chriſtian Religion; but he afterwards hurt the reputation of that work by another, called the Opening of the ſeven Seals. He died in Ireland in 1727.

Abadie, or *L'Abadie*, (John) was born in the province of Guienne in 1610. He was firſt a Jeſuit, then a Janſeniſt, and afterwards a Proteſtant; and at laſt wanted to form a ſect of his own, and unite with La Bourignon, who made him this reply, "That every one had their particular ſhare of the holy ſpirit, and that her's was greatly ſuperior to his." He has left thirty-one volumes of fanatical writings. I have given him a place here only as an example of the weakneſs of human underſtanding. He was not, however, without his diſciples. He died at Altena in 1674.

Ablancourt (Nicholas Perrot d'), of an ancient family, of the parliament of Paris, was born at Vitri in 1606. He was an elegant tranſlator, and every one of his performances of this kind was called the Beautiful Infidel. He died poor in 1664.

Acheri (Luke d'), a Benedictine monk: he was a great and judicious compiler: he was born in 1609, and died in 1685.

Alexan-

Alexander (Noel), a Dominican, born at Rouen in 1639. He was author of many theological pieces; and had great diſputes, concerning the Chineſe cuſtoms, with the Jeſuits that returned from thence: he died in 1724.

Amelot de la Houſſaie (Nicholas), was born at Orleans in 1634. His tranſlation with political notes, and his hiſtorical writings, are greatly ſought after; but his alphabetical Memoirs are very faulty. He was the firſt who ever furniſhed a true idea of the Venetian government. The ſenate took umbrage at his hiſtory, being ſtill prepoſſeſſed with the old miſtaken notion, that there are certain political myſteries which ought not to be revealed. Since then, however, it has been diſcovered that there are no ſuch myſteries, and that true policy conſiſts in being rich, and keeping good armies on foot. Amelot tranſlated and commented upon Machiavel's Prince, a work which was long the favourite of petty lords, who diſputed for ill governed territories; but became uſeleſs at the time that ſo many mighty princes, always in arms, ſuppreſſed the ambitious views of the weaker. Amelot thought himſelf the greateſt politician in Europe; but he could never riſe above a middling ſtation, and at length died extremely poor: the reaſon was, that he was a politician in genius only, and not in character. He died in 1706.

Amelotte (Dionis), born at Saintongue in 1606. He belonged to the oratory: he is principally known by a tolerable good verſion of the New Teſtament. He died in 1678.

Amontons (William), born at Paris in 1663: he was an excellent mathematician. He died in 1699.

Ancillon (David) was born at Metz in 1617: he was a Calviniſt, and, together with his ſon Charles, who died at Berlin in 1715, gained ſome literary reputation.

Anſelm, an Auguſtin monk. He was the firſt who compiled a genealogical hiſtory of the great officers of the crown, which has been continued and augmented by Du Fourni, auditor of accounts. We have but a very confuſed notion of what conſtitutes the great officers of the crown. It is generally thought they are thoſe who bear the title of *great*, in virtue of their office; as grand maſter of the horſe, and grand cup-bearer: but the conſtables, the marſhals, and the chancellors, are great officers, though they do not bear the title of great; and there are others who do bear this title, and yet are not reckoned great officers. The captain of the guards, and the firſt gentleman of the bedchamber, are, in fact, become great officers, though they are not reckoned ſuch by father Anſelm. However, there is nothing certain on this head; and there is as great confuſion and uncertainty in regard to all the rights and titles in France, as there is order and regulation in the adminiſtration. He died in 1694.

Arnauld (Anthony), a doctor of the Sorbonne, born in 1612, and the twentieth ſon of that Arnauld who pleaded againſt the Jeſuits. He is univerſally known for his eloquence, his erudition, and his diſputes, which acquired him ſo much reputation, and made him at the ſame time ſo unfortunate, according to our ordinary ideas of things, which place exile and poverty in the number of misfortunes, without reflecting that glory, friends, and an healthy old age, were the

portion of this famous man. It is ſaid, in the ſupplement to Moreri, that Arnauld, in 1689, in order to ingratiate himſelf with the court, compoſed a libel againſt king William, under the title of "a true Picture of William Henry of Naſſau, the modern Abſalom, Herod, Cromwell, and Nero." This ſtile, which reſembles that of father Garaſſe, is very unlike Arnauld's. Beſides, he never entertained a notion of flattering the court. A book with ſo groſs a title would have met with a very bad reception from Lewis XIV. and thoſe who aſcribe this work, and the view in which it was written, to the famous Arnauld, are ignorant that writing books was no kind of introduction to that court. This great man died at Bruſſels in 1694.

Arnauld d'Andilly (Robert), elder brother to the former, was born in 1588. He was one of the great writers of Port-Royal. His tranſlation of Joſephus, which is the moſt eſteemed of all his works, was preſented by him to Lewis XIV. at the age of 85. He was father of Simon Arnauld, marquis of Pompone and miniſter of ſtate, who, notwithſtanding his high character and intereſt, was unable to prevent the diſgrace which befel his uncle the doctor of the Sorbonne, on account of his diſputes. He died in 1674.

Aubignac (Francis d'). He was born in 1604. He had never any other maſter but himſelf: he was attached to cardinal Richelieu; but a great enemy to Corneille. His *Pratique des Theatres*, or Practice of the Stage, ſtill continues to be read; but he plainly proved by his tragedy of Zenobia, that knowledge does not give talents. He died in 1676.

Aubri

Aubri (Anthony) was born in 1616. We have the lives of cardinal Richelieu and Mazarin written by him, which, though indifferent productions in themſelves, afford ſome inſtruction. He died in 1695.

D'Aunoi (the counteſs). Her Memoirs and Travels into Spain, together with ſome romances written in an eaſy ſtile, have gained her ſome reputation. She died in 1705.

D'Auvrigni, the Jeſuit. He is author of "A new Method of writing Hiſtory." We have his "Chronological Annals from the Year 1601 to 1715," in which every thing of importance that paſſed in Europe, during that ſpace of time, is accurately and conciſely related. He is very exact in the dates of his tranſactions. No writer has ever made a juſter diſtinction between truth, falſhood, and uncertainty. He has likewiſe compoſed Eccleſiaſtical Memoirs; but unhappily they are tainted with a party-ſpirit. Marcel and he have both been eclipſed by the preſident Henaut in his Chronological Hiſtory of France, which is the moſt conciſe, and at the ſame time the moſt complete work of the kind ever publiſhed, and the moſt convenient for the reader.

Baillet (Adrian) was born in the neighbourhood of Beauvais in 1649: he was a famous critic. He died in 1706.

Baluze (Stephen), of the Limouſin, born in 1631. He formed the collection of MS. in Colbert's library: he continued his labours until the age of eighty-eight. We are indebted to him for ſeven volumes of ancient Monuments. He ſuffered exile for defending the pretenſions of the cardinal de Bouillon, who imagined himſelf independent of the king, and founded his pretenſions

tenſions on being born of a ſovereign prince, during the time when that prince was ſtill in poſſeſſion of Sedan. He died in 1718.

Balzac (John-Lewis) was born in 1594. He was very eloquent, and the firſt who founded the prize for eloquence: he had the patent of hiſtoriographer of France, and counſellor of ſtate, which he called ſplendid trifles. He died in 1654.

Barbeirac (John) was born at Beziers in 1674. He was a Calviniſt, was profeſſor of law and hiſtory at Lauſanne, and was the tranſlator and commentator of Puffendorf and Grotius. Theſe treatiſes upon the laws of nations, and upon peace and war, which have never been ſerviceable in any treaty of peace, nor in any declaration of war, nor to ſecure the right of any perſon, ſeem to be a conſolation to the people for the evils which have been wrought by force and policy, by giving them ſuch an idea of juſtice as ſeems, like the portraits of celebrated perſons, to ſhew us thoſe we cannot otherwiſe ſee. He died in 1729.

Barbier Darcourt (John), known among the Jeſuits by the name of the Advocate Sacrus, and in the world by his Criticiſm on the Dialogues of Father Bouhours, and by his excellent pleading for a perſon who was put to the rack. He was a long time protected by Colbert, who made him comptroller of the king's buildings; but having loſt his protector, he died in miſery in 1694.

Barbier (mademoiſelle). This lady wrote ſeveral tragedies.

Baron (Michael). The pieces which he publiſhed under his own name are thought not to be his: his chief excellence was as a player, in which

which art he roſe to a degree of perfection rarely to be found, and that ſeemed peculiar to himſelf. The theatric art requires all the gifts of nature, joined to a great underſtanding and unwearied application; and yet this art do many obſtinately contemn. The preachers were frequently wont to come to the houſe, and ſit in a cloſe box, with a grate before it, to ſtudy Baron, and afterwards go and declaim againſt the ſtage. It is cuſtomary for the confeſſor of a player, who is about to die, to require him to renounce his profeſſion. Baron had quitted the ſtage in 1691, upon ſome diſlike; and returned to it again in 1720, when he was ſixty-eight years old. He continued to be admired as a player until 1729: he was then near ſeventy-eight, and retired from the ſtage a ſecond time, and died the ſame year. On his death-bed he proteſted, that he had never had the leaſt ſcruple to repeat before the public the maſter-pieces of wit and morality of the celebrated writers of the nation; and that he thought nothing could be ſo abſurd as to annex an idea of ſhame to the repeating that which it was glorious to compoſe.

Baſnage (James) was born at Rouen in 1653. He was a Calviniſt, and a paſtor at the Hague; but he was fitter to be a miniſter of ſtate than of a pariſh. Of all his books, his hiſtory of the Jews, of the United Provinces, and of the Church, are the moſt eſteemed. Books on temporary ſubjects die with the circumſtances that gave birth to them, while works of general utility remain for ever. He died in 1723.

Baſnage de Beauval (Henry) of Rouen, profeſſed the law in Holland, but was more of a philoſopher, and wrote upon Toleration in Religion.

ligion. He was a man of great induſtry, and publiſhed an edition of Furetier's Dictionary with additions. He died in 1710.

Baſſompiere (Francis, marſhal of). Though his memoirs properly belong to the age preceding that of Lewis XIV. yet we give him a place in this catalogue, as having died in 1646.

Baudran (Michael) was born at Paris in 1633. He was a geographer, but inferior in reputation to Sanſon. He died in 1700.

Bayle (Peter) was born at Carlat, in the county of Foix, in 1647. He retired into Holland rather as a philoſopher than a Calviniſt. He was perſecuted in his life-time by Jurieux, and after his death by the enemies to philoſophy. Could he have foreſeen how univerſally his Dictionary would be read, he would have made it ſtill more uſeful, by retrenching obſcure and increaſing the illuſtrious names: he is more eſteemed for his excellent manner of reaſoning than for his ſtile, that being frequently too prolix, looſe, and incorrect; and ſometimes ſo familiar as to ſink into a degree of lowneſs: he was rather a great logician than a profound philoſopher: he underſtood ſcarcely any thing of natural philoſophy, and was wholly unacquainted with the diſcoveries of the great Newton. Almoſt all his philoſophical articles take for granted, or elſe contradict a Carteſian theory, which has no longer any exiſtence: he knew no other definition of matter than extent: its other acknowledged or ſuppoſed properties have at length given birth to true philoſophy. There have been new demonſtrations and new doubts, ſo that the ſceptical Bayle is in ſeveral places not enough of the ſceptic: he lived and

died

died like a wiſe man. Des Maiſeux has written his life, of which he has made a large volume, whereas it ought not to have exceeded ſix pages. The life of a ſedentary writer is to be found in his works. He died in 1706.

Beaumant de Perefixe (Hardouin) was preceptor to Lewis XIV. and archbiſhop of Paris. His Hiſtory of Henry IV. which is only an abridgment, inſpires us with a love for that great prince, and is well calculated to form a good king. He compoſed it for the uſe of his royal pupil. It was thought that Mezerai had a ſhare in writing it: there is indeed a good deal of his manner in it; but Mezerai was not maſter of that affecting ſtile in many places ſo worthy of the prince whoſe life Perefixe wrote, and of him to whom he addreſſed it. Thoſe excellent counſels for governing alone were not inſerted until the ſecond edition, after the death of cardinal Mazarin. We can form a much juſter idea of Henry IV. from a peruſal of this hiſtory, than from that of Daniel, which is written in a dry manner, and has too much about father Cotton, and too little concerning the great qualities of Henry IV. and the particulars of the life of this excellent king. Perefix affects every ſenſible heart, and makes us adore the memory of this prince, whoſe weakneſſes were only thoſe of an amiable man, and whoſe virtues were thoſe of a great one. He died in 1670.

Beauſobre (Iſaac de) was born at Niort in 1659, of a family diſtinguiſhed in the profeſſion of arms. He was one of thoſe who have done honour to their country, which they have been obliged to quit. His Hiſtory of Manicheaniſm is one of the moſt learned, curious, and beſt written

written pieces extant: here we find clearly explained the philoſophical religion of the Manes, which was formed upon the dogmas of the antient Zoroaſter and Hermes, which for a long time ſeduced St. Auguſtine himſelf. This hiſtory is enriched with many curious things in antiquity; but after all, this, like ſo many other excellent works, is only a collection of human errors. He died at Berlin in 1738.

Benſerade (Iſaac de) was born in Normandy in 1612. His little houſe at Gentilli, to which he retired towards the end of his life, was filled with inſcriptions in verſe, which were of more worth than his other works: it is pity they were never collected. He died in 1691.

Bergier (Nicholas) had the title of hiſtoriographer of France; but he is better known by his curious Hiſtory of the great Roads of the Roman Empire, which are now ſurpaſſed by ours in beauty, but not in ſolidity. His ſon put the finiſhing hand to this uſeful work, and printed it under the reign of Lewis XIV. *Bergier* died in 1623.

Bernard (Mademoiſelle) has written ſome dramatic pieces, in conjunction with the famous Bernard de Fontenelle. It may not be improper to obſerve in this place, that the allegorical fable of Imagination and Happineſs, which has been publiſhed under her name, was written by La Pariſiere, biſhop of Nimes, ſucceſſor to Fléchier.

Bernard (James) of Dauphiny was born in 1658. He was a man of great learning and knowledge: his journals have been eſteemed. He died in Holland in 1718.

Bernier

Bernier (Francis) ſurnamed the Mogul, was born at Angers about the year 1625. He was eight years phyſician to the emperor of the Indies: his voyages are curious: he wanted, with Gaſſendi, to revive in part the Epicurean ſyſtem of Atoms, in which he was certainly much in the right; for the ſpecies could not be always reproduced alike, unleſs the firſt principles were themſelves invariable: but at that time the romantic doctrine of Deſcartes was all the faſhion. He died like a true philoſopher in 1688.

Bignon (Jerom) born in 1590. He has left a name greater than his works: he lived before the time of good literature. The parliament, to which he was advocate-general, with reaſon reveres his memory. He died in 1656.

Billaut (Adam) known by the name of Maitre Adam, or Maſter Adam, a joiner of Nevers. We muſt not ſuffer ſo extraordinary a perſon to go unnoticed, who, without any learning, became a poet in his ſhop: nor can we paſs over the following rondeaux of his, which is much better than many of Benſerade's.

Pour te guérir de cette ſciatique,
Qui te retient, comme un paralitique,
Entre deux draps ſans aucun mouvement,
Pren-moi deux brocs d'un fin jus de ſarment;
Puis li comment on le met en pratique.
Prens-en deux doigts, & bien chauds les applique
Sur l'épiderme où la douleur te pique,
Et tu boiras le reſte promptement,
Pour te guérir.
Sur cet avis ne ſois point hérétique;
Car je te fais un ſerment autentique,
Que ſi tu crains ce doux médicament,

Ton

Ton Médecin pour ton ſoulagement
Fera l'eſſai de ce qu'il communique,
Pour te guérir.

To cure thee of that curs'd arthritic,
Which keeps thee like a paralytic,
Between two ſheets depriv'd of motion,
Provide two flaſks of ſov'reign potion,
The grape's beſt juice, that grand ſpecific
Part warm apply, thy pains terrific
Will fly before its pow'r pacific;
Then drink the reſt with pure devotion;
And this will cure thee.
But, if in faith thou'rt not prolific,
To make it ſtill more ſcientific,
Thy doctor ſhall confirm this notion,
And drink it up, were it an ocean,
To prove its virtue ſudorific;
I can aſſure thee.

He had penſions both from cardinal Richelieu and Gaſton brother to Lewis XIII. He died in 1662.

Bochart (Samuel) was born at Rouen in 1599. He was a Calviniſt, and one of the moſt learned men in Europe for languages and hiſtory: he was one of thoſe who went to Sweden at once to inſtruct and admire the famous queen Chriſtina. He died in 1667.

Boileau Deſpreaux (Nicholas) of the academy. He was born in the village of Crone, in the neighbourhood of Paris, in 1636: he made his firſt eſſay at the bar, and afterwards entered into the college of the Sorbonne: but alike diſpleaſed with the tricks of both, he gave himſelf up entirely to the impulſe of his genius, and became

the honour of France. His works have been already ſo much commented upon, that any panegyric here would be ſuperfluous. He died in 1711.

Boileau (Giles) born at Paris in 1631. He was the elder brother of the famous Boileau. There are ſome tranſlations of his which are of more worth than his verſes. He died in 1669.

Boileau (James) another elder brother of Deſpreaux, and a doctor of the Sorbonne. He had a whimſical genius, and wrote ſome pieces of an extraordinary kind, in as extraordinary Latin, namely, The Hiſtory of the Flagellantes, or Floggers; *Les Attouchemens Impudiques*, the Laſcivious Touches; *Les Habits des Prêtres*, the Prieſts Dreſſes, &c. He died in 1716.

Boiſrobert (Francis le Metel) more famous for being a favourite of cardinal Richelieu, and for his good fortune, than for his merit: he compoſed eighteen dramatic pieces, which met with no favour but from his patron. He died in 1662.

Boivin (John) was born in Normandy in 1633, was brother to Lewis Boivin, and like him furniſhed lights for the better underſtanding the Greek writers. He died in 1726.

Du Bos (the Abbé.) His hiſtory of the League of Cambray, is a learned, political, and intereſting work. It gives an inſight into the cuſtoms and manners of theſe times, and may juſtly be eſteemed a model in this kind of writing: his reflections on poetry, painting, and muſic, are read with emolument by all artiſts. It is the moſt uſeful performance of the kind that has appeared on thoſe ſubjects in any nation of Europe. The chief excellence of this work is, that with a very

few errors, it abounds with juſt, new, and learned reflections. It is not a methodical work; but the author thinks himſelf, and teaches his readers to think. With all that, he was ignorant of muſic, he never wrote a line of poetry, and did not poſſeſs a ſingle picture: but he had read, ſeen, heard, and reflected a great deal. He died in 1742.

Boſſu (René le) a regular canon of St. Genevieve. He was born at Paris in 1631: he attempted to reconcile Ariſtotle and Deſcartes, without reflecting that both the one and the other ought to be thrown aſide: his treatiſe on epic poetry is in great reputation; but it will never form poets. He died in 1680.

Boſſuet (James Benignus) of Dijon, was born in 1627: he was biſhop of Condom, and afterwards of Meaux. We have fifty-one different pieces of his writing; but his Funeral Orations, and his Diſcourſe on Univerſal Hiſtory, are the works that have immortalized his name. It has been ſeveral times aſſerted in print, that this biſhop was married, and that St. Hyacinthus, who was famous for the ſhare he had in the little joke of Matanaſius, paſſed for his ſon; but there never was any proof of this. A family of eminence in Paris, which has produced ſeveral perſons of diſtinguiſhed merit, affirm, that there was a private contract of marriage between Boſſuet, when very young, and one mademoiſelles des Vieux; that this lady made a ſacrifice of her paſſions and hopes to the intereſt of her lover, whoſe eloquence bid fair to procure him conſiderable advancement in the church, and conſented to give up the contract, as the marriage had not been conſummated; that Boſ-

fiet, releaſed from his engagements, entered into holy orders; and that after his death this family had the ſettling of this affair, and declare that the lady never made an ill uſe of the dangerous ſecrets ſhe was miſtreſs of: ſhe always lived in a chaſte and reſpectful friendſhip with the biſhop of Meaux, who enabled her to purchaſe the little eſtate of Maulion, about five leagues diſtant from Paris, of which ſhe took the title, and lived to almoſt the age of an hundred. It is moreover pretended that this great man's ſentiments as a philoſopher were different from what he taught as a divine, like a learned magiſtrate, who at the ſame time that he gives ſentence, according to the letter of the law, may in private riſe ſuperior to it by the force of his genius. He died in 1704.

Bouchenu de Valbonnais (John Peter) was born at Grenoble in 1651: he made ſeveral voyages in the early part of his life, and was on board the Engliſh fleet at the ſea-fight off Solebay: he was afterwards preſident of the chamber of accounts in Dauphiny: his memory is ſtill held dear by the inhabitants of Grenoble, for the good he did in that place, and to all men of learning for his noble enquiries: he compoſed his Memoirs of Dauphiny when he was blind, from what was read to him. He died in 1730.

Bouhier. The author of ſeveral natural pieces of poetry. When he was dying, at the age of eighty-ſix, he made this epitaph for himſelf:

J'etais poëte, hiſtorien;
Et maintenant, je ne ſuis rien,

Once poet and hiſtorian, I,
Now duſt, in dark oblivion, lie.

Bouhier, preſident of the parliament of Dijon: he is famous for his erudition: he tranſlated ſome paſſages of the antient Latin poets into French verſe, being of opinion that this was the only good way of tranſlating them; but his poety ſhews the difficulty of ſuch an undertaking.

Bouhours (Dominic) a Jeſuit, was born at Paris in 1628. The French language and good taſte owe him many obligation: he was author of ſeveral very good pieces, which gave birth to ſome excellent criticiſms: *ex privatis odiis reſpublica creſcit.* His Life of St. Ignatius de Loyola did not greatly pleaſe the generality of readers; and that of St. Francis Xavier underwent ſome ſtrictures; but his remarks on language, and above all his Method of judging rightly of Works of Genius, will be always of uſe to young people, who are deſirous of forming their taſte: he teaches them to avoid bombaſt, obſcurity, far fetched and falſe thoughts. If he paſſes ſentence ſomewhat too ſeverely upon certain paſſages of Taſſo, and other Italian authors, he as often condemns them juſtly: his ſtile is pure and pleaſing. The little tract abovementioned greatly offended the Italians, and brought on a kind of national quarrel. It was thought, that the opinion of father Bouhours, which was ſtrengthened by that of Boileau, might come to be a kind of law. The marquis d' Orſi, and ſome others, compoſed two very large volumes in defence of ſome of Taſſo's verſes: but here let it be remarked, that father Bouhours would have had very little right to reproach the Italian writers with their falſe thoughts, who himſelf compares Ignatius Loyola to Cæſar, and Francis Xavier

Xavier to Alexander, only that he was very seldom guilty of these faults.

Bouillaud (Ishmael) of Loudoun, was born in 1605: he was learned in history and the mathematics. He died in 1694.

Boulainvilliers (the count of) of the house of Crouy: the most learned gentleman of the kingdom in history, and the most capable of writing that of France, had he not been too systematical. He calls the antient feudal government the Master-piece of Human Genius: he regrets those times in which the people, enslaved by ignorant and brutal petty tyrants, were without industry, commerce, or property; and is of opinion, that an hundred lords, the oppressors of the earth, and the enemies of their prince, composed the most perfect of all governments. Notwithstanding this wild hypothesis he was an excellent citizen, as, notwithstanding his weakness for judicial astrology, he was an able philosopher, so far as it is part of a philosopher to hold life for nothing, and despise death. There is printed at the end of his works, A large scheme for rendering the king of France richer than all the other Monarchs of the World. But it is plain that this piece is not the count de Boulainvilliers. He died about the year 1720.

Bourdaloue, was born at Bourges in 1632; he was a Jesuit, and the chief model for all good preachers in Europe. He died in 1704.

Bourfault (Edmund) was born in Burgundy in 1638: his letters to Babet, which were much esteemed at the time he wrote them, are become like all other epistolary writings in that taste, the amusement of young country people:

his comedy of Æſop is ſtill played. He died in 1701.

Bourſeis (Amable) was born in Auvergne in 1606: he was author of ſeveral works of politics and controverſy. Silhon and he are ſuſpected of compoſing the Political Teſtament, ſaid to have been made by cardinal Richelieu. He died in 1672.

Brebeuf (William) was born in Normandy in 1638: he is known by his tranſlation of the Pharſalia; but it is not ſo generally known that he was the author of *Lucan traveſti*. He died in 1661.

Breteuil, Marchioneſs du Chatelet (Gabriel Emilia) was born in 1706. She illuſtrated the writings of Leibnitz, and tranſlated Newton with comments; a merit which was of little uſe to her at court, but which gained her the veneration of every nation that had a love for learning, who admired her depth of genius and eloquence. Of all the women who have adorned France, ſhe had the greateſt ſhare of true underſtanding, and affected the leaſt to be thought a wit. She died in 1749.

Brienne (Henry-Auguſtus de Lomenie de), ſecretary of ſtate: he has left ſome memoirs. It would be uſeful for miniſters of ſtate to compoſe memoirs; but then they ſhould be ſuch as thoſe which have been lately collected under the name of the duke of Sully. He died in 1666.

La Bruyere (John) was born at Dourdain in 1644. It is certain, that in his Characters he has given us the portraits of ſeveral well-known and conſiderable perſonages. This work has occaſioned a great many bad imitators. He died in 1696.

De

De Bruis (the abbé) was born in Languedoc in 1639. Although the author of ten volumes of controverſy, his name would have been buried in oblivion; but his petit piece called *Le Grondeur* (the Grumbler), which is far ſuperior to any of Moliere's farces, and the Advocate Patelin, an ancient monument of the true Gauliſh ſimplicity revived by him, will make him known as long as there is a ſtage in France. He was aſſiſted by Palaprat in theſe two pretty pieces. Theſe are the only works of genius that were ever compoſed by two authors jointly. He died in 1723.

I cannot cloſe this article without taking notice of a very extraordinary event, to be met with in the Collection of literary Anecdotes, printed by Durand in 1650, vol. ii. p. 369, where the author tells us, "the Amours of Lewis XIV. having been introduced in a play upon the Engliſh ſtage, Lewis was willing, in return, to exhibit thoſe of king William upon the French theatre; and the abbé de Bruis was ordered by the marquis de Torci to write a piece upon this ſubject, which he did; but though it was greatly applauded by thoſe who ſaw it in MS. it was never performed."

Here let it be obſerved, that this Collection of Anecdotes, which is full of the like tales, is printed with approbation and privilege. Now the amours of Lewis XIV. were never made the ſubject of a piece played on the Engliſh ſtage; and it is well known, that king William had never any miſtreſs; or, if he had, Lewis XIV. knew too well what he owed to good-breeding to order any one to write a comedy upon William's amours: M. de Torci was not a perſon

to make ſo impertinent a propoſal; and, in ſhort, the abbé de Bruis never thought of writing ſo ridiculous a piece as that aſcribed to him. It cannot be too often repeated, that the greateſt part of the collections of anecdotes, *anas*, and ſecret memoirs, with which the public is over-run, are only wretched compilations, patched up in a hurry, to anſwer the purpoſes of indigent or mercenary ſcribblers.

Brumoi (the Jeſuit). His Greek Theatre paſſes for one of the beſt works of the kind: he has ſhewn by his poetry, that it is much eaſier to tranſlate and praiſe the antients, than to equal the celebrated moderns by productions of one's own. This author is likewiſe chargeable with not having had a ſufficient idea of the ſuperiority of the French ſtage over that of the Greeks, and the prodigious difference between the Miſanthrope of Moliere and the Frogs of Ariſtophanes.

Brun (Peter le) was born at Aix in 1661. He belonged to the Oratory. His critical treatiſe on Superſtitious Practices has been greatly eſteemed; but he is a phyſician who gives an account of a very few diſeaſes only, and is himſelf much diſordered. He died in 1729.

Buffier (Claud), a Jeſuit. His Artificial Memory is of very great ſervice to thoſe who are deſirous of retaining the principal events of hiſtory always freſh in their minds: he has made that uſe of verſe, (I will not ſay poetry) for which it was originally intended; namely, to imprint on the mind thoſe events which men are deſirous of remembring.

Buſſy Rabutin (Roger, count of), was born in the Nivernois in 1618. He wrote with purity: his

his misfortunes and his productions * are ſufficiently known: he died at Autun in 1693.

Cailly (the chevalier de), known only by the name of Acceilly: he was devoted to the ſervice of the miniſter Colbert. The time of his birth and death are alike unknown. There is a collection of his of ſome hundreds of epigrams, amongſt which there are ſeveral very bad, and ſome tolerably pretty: he wrote naturally, but without any imagination in his expreſſion.

Calprenede (Walter de la) was born at Cahors, about the year 1612. He was one of the gentlemen in ordinary to the king: he was the firſt who brought long romances into faſhion. The merit of theſe conſiſted in a number of adventures, the intrigue of which was artfully enough conducted, and, though incredible, not altogether impoſſible. Boyardo, Arioſto, and Taſſo, on the contrary, loaded their poetic romances with fictions entirely unnatural; but the charms of their verſification, the innumerable beauties of the detail, and the admirable allegories, eſpecially thoſe of Arioſto, altogether, have made their poems immortal; while the works of La Calprenede, like moſt other great romance-

* The ſource of his diſgrace was a book which he wrote, called the Amorous Hiſtory of the Gauls, containing the moſt remarkable amours of the age. The piece was not intended for the preſs; but was preſented in manuſcript to the king, who was ſo much incenſed, that he ſent the author to the Baſtile. The count himſelf pretended, that it was altered, garbled, and interpolated in a ſhocking manner before it was produced to his majeſty. He made great efforts to obtain the king's forgiveneſs; and, being releaſed from the Baſtile, was exiled to his own houſe in the country, where he lived to a good old age, without ever being able to retrieve the good graces of his maſter.

writers, are ſunk in eſtimation. What has chiefly contributed to their fall, is the great perfection the ſtage is arrived at. In a good tragedy, or a good opera, we meet with a much greater number of ſentiments than are to be found in all theſe enormous volumes: theſe ſentiments are at the ſame time much better expreſſed, and there appears a much clearer knowledge of the human heart. Thus Racine and Quinault, who have given a little into the ſtile of theſe romances, have contributed to obliterate them by ſpeaking more truly to the heart, and in a manner more tender and harmonious. He died in 1663.

Campiſtron (John) was born at Toulouſe in 1656. He was a pupil and imitator of Racine. The duke of Vendome, whoſe ſecretary he was, made his fortune; and Baron the player, in part, his reputation. There are ſome affecting ſtrokes in his pieces, though they are in general but weakly written: however, the language is pure; and ſince his time this requiſite has been ſo much neglected in our theatrical pieces, that at length the ſtile is become almoſt barbarous. This is what Boileau greatly lamented at his death. He died in 1723.

Du Cange (Charles du Freſne) was born at Amiens in 1610. His two Gloſſaries are well known for being of the greateſt uſe towards underſtanding the cuſtoms of the latter empire, and the following ages. He was one of thoſe who was rewarded by Lewis XIV. He died in 1688.

Coſſandre. He and Dacier have done more ſervice to the reputation of Ariſtotle, than all the pretended philoſophers together. He tranſlated his treatiſe on Rhetoric, as well as Dacier has done

done the treatiſe on Poetry, of that famous Greek; and we cannot but admire Ariſtotle, and the age of Alexander, when we find that the preceptor of that great man, who has been ſo much decried for his natural philoſophy, was intimately acquainted with the principles of eloquence and poetry. Where is the naturaliſt of our age capable of giving rules at the ſame time for an oration and a tragedy? Caſſandre lived and died in a ſtate of extreme poverty. This was not owing to the want of talents; but to a ſtubborn, morooſe, and unſociable diſpoſition. Many who complain of the unkindneſs of fortune have often only themſelves to blame.

Caſſini (John-Dominick) was born in the county of Nice in 1625, and was invited to France by Colbert in 1666. He was the firſt aſtronomer of his age; but he began, like all others, by the ſtudy of aſtrology. As he was naturalized in France, and married and had children there, and died at Paris, he may juſtly be accounted in the number of Frenchmen. He has rendered his name immortal by his meridional clock of St. Petrona at Boulogne, which ſhews the variations in the ſwiftneſs of the earth's motion round the ſun. He was the firſt who demonſtrated, by the parallax of the planet Mars, that the ſun is at leaſt thirty-three millions of miles diſtant from the earth. He foretold the path deſcribed by the comet of 1664: he likewiſe diſcovered the five ſatellites of Saturn, of which Huyghens had ſeen only one; and this diſcovery of Caſſini's was celebrated in an hiſtorical medal of Lewis XIV. He died in 1712.

Catrou was born in 1659. He was a Jeſuit, and, in conjunction with father Rouillé, com-

poſed twenty volumes of the Roman Hiſtory, in which, for the ſake of eloquence, they have neglected exactneſs. He died in 1737.

Du Cerceau (John-Anthony) was born in 1670. He was a Jeſuit. In his French poetry, which is but of the middling kind, there are ſome verſes natural and happily turned. He has intermixed the purity of ſtile of the age he wrote in, with ſomething in the manner of Marot; a ſtile which, by its too great negligence, enervates poetry, and ſpoils the preſent language, by introducing antiquated words and terms. He died in 1730.

Ceriſi (Germain-Habert). He lived in the dawn of good taſte, at the time when the French academy was firſt eſtabliſhed. His Metamorphoſis of Phillis's Eyes into Stars was cried up as a maſter piece; but ceaſes to be ſo, ſince the appearance of ſo many excellent writers. He died in 1655.

La Chambre (Marin Cureau de). He was born at Mons in 1594: he was one of the firſt members of the academy: he died in 1669. Both he and his ſon had ſome ſhare of reputation.

Chantereau (Lewis le Fevre) was born in 1588. He was a man of great learning, and one of the firſt who cleared up the hiſtory of France; but he has given ſanction to a great error, namely, that the hereditary fiefs did not begin until after the reign of Hugh Capet; whereas, if we regard only the example of Normandy, which was given, or rather extorted, by the title of an hereditary fief in 912, it will be ſufficient to overthrow the opinion of Chantereau, which has been adopted by ſeveral hiſtorians. It is moreover certain, that feudal honours, with property,

were

were inſtituted in France by Charlemagne, and that this form of government was known before his time in Lombardy and Germany. Chantereau died in 1658.

Chapelain (John) was born in 1595. Had it not been for his Pucelle, (or Maid of Orleans), he would have had ſome reputation in the literary world: he got more, however, by that wretched poem than Homer did by his Iliad. Chapelain was nevertheleſs of ſome uſe by his learning. It was he who corrected Racine's firſt poetical attempts. At his firſt ſetting out, he was the oracle of all poets, and at length became their diſgrace: he died in 1674.

La Chapelle, receiver-general of the finances, author of ſome tragedies, which had ſucceſs in their time. He was one of thoſe who endeavoured to imitate Racine; for this great writer, like the great maſters in painting, formed a ſchool without knowing it. This Raphael in poetry did not, however, form a Julio Romano; and yet ſome of his firſt diſciples wrote with tolerable purity of language; whereas, in the decline which followed, we have ſeen, even in our time, whole tragedies, in which there are not four lines together without ſome groſs faults.

Chapelle (Claude Huillier), natural ſon to de l'Huillier, maſter of accounts. It is not true that he was the firſt who made uſe of double rhimes: d'Aſſouci uſed them before him, and even with ſome ſucceſs.

Pourquoi donc, ſexe au teint de roſe,
Quand la charité vous impoſe
La loi d'aimer votre prochain,
Pouvez-vous me haïr ſans cauſe,

Moi

Moi qui ne vous fis jamais rien ?
Eh ! pour mon honneur je vois bien
Qu'il faut vous faire quelque choſe.

Ah ! ſex, by nature form'd to pleaſe,
When charity this law decrees,
That one another we ſhould love :
Can you thus hate with ſo much eaſe,
Me who am harmleſs as a dove ?
I find, mine honour to approve,
I muſt do ſomething more than teaſe.

Chapelle had more ſucceſs than others in that kind of verſe which requires grace and harmony; but even here he frequently prefers a barren abundance of rhimes to the thought and turn. His voluptuous manner of living, and the few pretenſions he made, contributed greatly to the fame of his little pieces. It is known, that in his Voyage to Montpellier there are many ſtrokes of Bachaumont, ſon to the preſident le Coigneux, one of the moſt amiable men of his time. Chapelle was moreover one of the beſt pupils of the famous Gaſſendi : however, we ſhall always diſtinguiſh between the encomiums that ſo many men of letters have beſtowed on Chapelle, and geniuſes of his ſtamp, and thoſe which are given to great maſters. He died in 1686.

Chardin (John) was born at Paris in 1643. No traveller has left more curious memoirs. He died at London in 1713.

Charleval (John Faucon de Ris): He was one of thoſe who acquired reputation by a delicacy of genius, without making it too public.

The famous dialogue between marechal d'Hocquincourt and father Canaye, printed at the end of

of St. Evremont's works, was written by Charleval, as far as the little diſſertation upon Janſeniſm and Moliniſm, which was added by St. Evremont. The ſtile of this latter part is very different from that of the beginning. The late monſieur de Caumartin, counſellor of ſtate, was in poſſeſſion of Charleval's own MS. We are told in Moreri, that the preſident de Ris, nephew to Charleval, would not ſuffer his uncle's works to be printed, leſt the name of an author ſhould happen to prove a diſgrace to the family. A man muſt be very meanly bred, and very weak, to advance any thing of this nature in the preſent age; and in a perſon of the long robe it would have been an inſtance of pride, worthy only of the times of military ignorance and barbariſm, when ſtudy was left wholly to thoſe of the robe, through a contempt for both the one and the other.

Charpentier (Francis) was born at Paris in 1620. He was a uſeful academic. We have a tranſlation of the Cyropædia by him: he was a ſtrenuous defender of the opinion, that our public monumental inſcriptions in France ſhould be in the French language. In fact, it is degrading a language, which is now ſpoken through all Europe, to be diffident of uſing it; and it is acting counter to the intention to ſpeak to a whole people in a tongue that is unintelligible, to at leaſt three fourths of them. There is a kind of cruelty in latinizing French names, and as it may miſlead poſterity, and the names of Rocroi and Fontenoi have a more pleaſing ſound than thoſe of Rocroſium and Fonteniacum. He died in 1702.

La Châtre (Edme, marquis of) He has left ſome memoirs. He died in 1645.

Cha-

Chaulieu (William) was born in Normandy in 1639: he is well known for his eaſy and negligent way of writing verſe, and for the bold and ſenſual beauties found in them. Moſt of his verſes breath the ſpirit of freedom, pleaſure, and a philoſophy ſuperior to vulgar prejudice: this was his real character: he lived in pleaſure, and died with intrepidity in 1720.

Cheminais, a Jeſuit: he was called the Racine of preachers, and Bourdaloue the Corneille.

Cheron (Elizabeth) was born at Paris in 1648. She was famous for her knowledge of muſic, painting, and poetry, and was better known by her own name than by that of her huſband, the ſieur le Hay. She died in 1711.

Chevreau (Urban) was born at Loudoun in 1613: he was in much reputation as a learned man, and a great wit. He died in 1701.

Chifflet (John-James) was born at Beſancon in 1588. There are ſeveral Enquiries written by him. He died in 1660. There have been ſeven authors of this name.

Choiſi (Francis de) was born at Rouen in 1644: he was envoy at Siam, and has left us an account of that embaſſy: he compoſed ſeveral hiſtorical pieces, and a tranſlation of the Imitation of Jeſus Chriſt, dedicated to madame de Maintenon, with this motto; *Concupiſcet rex decorem tuum:* as alſo the Memoirs of the Counteſs des Barres, which counteſs is himſelf; he having worn the dreſs, and lived as a woman for ſeveral years: he made a purchaſe of an eſtate near Tours, under the name of the counteſs des Barres. In theſe Memoirs he relates freely the many miſtreſſes he had under this diſguiſe. Whilſt he led this life he wrote the

Hiſtory of the church. In his Memoirs of the Court we meet with ſeveral facts, of which ſome are true, ſome falſe, and many taken upon truſt; they are wrote in rather too familiar a ſtile.

Claude (John) was born in Agenois, in 1619. He was miniſter of Charenton, and was the pride of his ſect. He was worthy of being the rival of Boſſuet, Arnauld, and Nicole. He compoſed fifteen pieces, which were all greedily ſought after in thoſe times of diſputation. Polemical writings have all but their ſtated time; but the Fables of la Fontaine, and the Works of Arioſto, will be handed down to the lateſt poſterity. Five or ſix thouſand volumes of controverſy are already buried in oblivion. This writer died at the Hague, in 1687.

Le Cointe (Charles) was born at Troies, in 1611. He belonged to the oratory. His Eccleſiaſtical Annals, printed at the Louvre by order of the king, are uſeful monuments in their kind. He died in 1681.

Collet (Philibert) was born at Dombes in 1643. He was a civilian, and a free thinker. Being excommunicated by the biſhop of Lyons, on account of a pariſh quarrel, he wrote againſt the ſentence. He oppoſed the confinement of women in cloiſters, and, in his treatiſe on uſury, he argues ſtrongly in ſupport of the cuſtom eſtabliſhed at Breſſe, of ſtipulating the intereſt with the principal, a cuſtom adopted by the greateſt part of Europe, and followed by moſt of the trading part of the reſt, notwithſtanding the laws to the contrary, which are eaſily evaded. He likewiſe affirms, that the tithes

tithes paid to churchmen do not belong to them by divine right. He died in 1718.

Colomiez (Paul). The time of his birth is not known. His works begin to ſink into oblivion, but they are uſeful to thoſe who are fond of literary enquiries. He died at London in 1692.

Commire (the Jeſuit). He was in reputation amongſt thoſe who think that good Latin verſes may be made at preſent, and that foreigners are capable of reviving the Auguſtan age, in a language they are not even able to pronounce.

In ſilvam ne ligna feras.

Cordemoi (Gerald) was born at Paris. The learned world is obliged to him for having cleared up the confuſed accounts of the firſt races of the kings of France, and indebted to the duke of Montauſier for this uſeful undertaking, who ſet him about writing the hiſtory of Charlemagne, for the uſe of Monſeignear the dauphin, of whom he had the education. He met with nothing but abſurdities and contradictions in our old French hiſtorians; however the difficulty ſerved to encourage him, and he cleared up the two firſt races. He died in 1684.

Corneille (Peter) was born at Rouen in 1606. Though at preſent only ſix or ſeven of his pieces are played, yet he will always be the father of the ſtage. He is the firſt who raiſed the genius of the nation, and that is ſufficient to gain pardon for about twenty of his pieces, which, except in a very few places, are the worſt that we have, both for ſtile, barrenneſs of intrigue, and inſipid and miſplaced amours; and by a heap of

wire-

wire-drawn converſations, which are the reverſe of true tragedy. But we are to judge of a great man only by his excellencies, and not by his faults. It is ſaid that his tranſlation of the Imitation of Chriſt went through thirty-two editions; this however is as difficult to believe, as it is to read one of them. He received a gratification from the king in his laſt illneſs; he died in 1684.

It is ſaid in ſeveral printed collections of anecdotes, that he had a particular place ſet apart for him at the play-houſe, and that, whenever he came in, every body roſe and received him with a clap. Unhappily, mankind are not ſo ready to do juſtice to merit. The real truth is, that the king's comedians refuſed to play his eight laſt pieces, and he was obliged to give them to another company.

Corneille (Thomas) was born at Rouen in 1625. He would have gained great reputation, if he had not had a brother. There are thirty-four dramatic pieces of his. He died poor, in the year 1709.

Couſin (Lewis) was born at Paris in 1517. He was preſident of the court of Coins. We are indebted to him for ſeveral tranſlations from the Greek hiſtorians, which were not known before. He died in 1707.

The baron *des Coutiers* tranſlated Lucretius in proſe, with commentary-notes, about the middle of the reign of Lewis XIV. He was of the ſame way of thinking with that philoſopher, in relation to moſt of the firſt principles of things. He believed matter to be eternal, as did all the ancients. The Chriſtian religion has alone oppoſed this doctrine.

Dacier

Dacier, (Andrew) was born at Caſtres in 1651. He was originally a Calviniſt, as well as his wife, and, like her, became afterwards a Roman chatholic. He was keeper of the books in the king's cabinet of Paris, a poſt which no longer ſubſiſts. He was rather a learned man than an elegant writer; but his tranſlations and notes will always be of uſe. He died in the Louvre, in 1722.

Danchet. (Anthony) He ſucceeded in ſome few operas, by the aſſiſtance of the muſician, and they are ratlier better than his tragedies.

Dancourt, (Florence Carton) the advocate, was born in 1622, and choſe rather to apply himſelf to the ſtage than the bar. What Regnard was for high comedy, with regard to Moliere, Dancourt was for farce. Several of his pieces ſtill bring crouded houſes; they are full of life, and the dialogue is ſimple and natural. The number of theſe eaſy pieces of compoſition is immenſe: they better ſuit the taſte of the people, than delicate minds, but amuſement is one of the wants of mankind; and this kind of comedy, which is ſo eaſy to play, pleaſes, both in Paris and in the provinces, the majority, who are not capable of taſting more refined pleaſures. He died in 1726.

Danet (Peter) was one of thoſe writers who are more uſeful than celebrated. His dictionaries of the Latin language and of antiquities, were in the number of thoſe remarkable books compoſed for the education of Monſeigneur the dauphin, which, if they did not make a learned man of that prince, contributed not a little to the inſtruction of the kingdom. He died in 1709.

Dangeau

Dangeau (Lewis abbé de) was born in 1643. He was an excellent academic. He died in 1723.

Daniel (Gabriel), a Jeſuit. He was hiſtoriographer of France, and has rectified the miſtakes of Mezeray, concerning the firſt and ſecond races of our kings. It is alledged againſt him, that his diction is not always ſufficiently pure; that his ſtile is poor and unintereſting; that he is not lively in his deſcriptions; that he has not given ſufficient inſight into cuſtoms, manners, and laws; and that his hiſtory is a tedious detail of military operations, in which an hiſtorian of his character is almoſt always miſtaken.

The count of Boulainvilliers, in his memoirs on the French government, ſays, that Daniel is guilty of a thouſand errors. This is ſaying a great deal; but luckily thoſe errors are of as little conſequence as the real truths would have been in their room; for, of what importance is it, to know whether it was the right or the left wing that gave way at the battle of Montléri, or by what part Lewis the Fat entered the ruins of Puiſet? A member of ſociety is deſirous of knowing by what ſteps the government came to change its form, what were the ſeveral privileges and encroachments of the different bodies, what was done by the general eſtates, what was the ſpirit of the nation, &c. Father Daniel's hiſtory, with all its faults, is ſtill the beſt that is to be found, at leaſt till the reign of Lewis XI. He pretends, in his preface, that the early periods of the hiſtory of France are more intereſting than thoſe of Rome, becauſe Cloris and Dagobert poſſeſſed larger territories than Romulus and Tarquin. He was not

not aware, that the weak beginnings of all great things are intereſting to mankind; we are fond of beholding the trifling reign of a nation, to whom France was but a province, and that extended its empire to the Elbe, the Euphrates, and the Niger. It might be acknowledged, that our hiſtory, and that of other nations, from the fifth century of the vulgar æra to the fifteenth, is only a chaos of barbarous adventures, under barbarous names.

Dargonne (Noël) was born at Paris in 1634. He was a Carthuſian friar at Gaillon, and the only one of his order who ever cultivated literature. His miſcellanies, publiſhed under the name of Vigneul de Marville, are full of curious and bold anecdotes. He died in 1704.

Deſcartes, (René) born at Touraine in 1596, was ſon to a counſellor of the parliament of Brittany. He was the greateſt mathematician of his time, but a philoſopher who knew the leaſt of nature, when compared with thoſe who came after him. He paſſed the greateſt part of his life out of France, that he might purſue his philoſophical ſtudies more at liberty, in imitation of Saumaiſe, who took the like ſtep; but he was diſappointed of the quiet he thought to find in a retirement in Holland. Two profeſſors of the balderdaſh ſchool divinity, taught at that time, the one named Voet, and the other Shockius, brought the ridiculous charge of atheiſm againſt him, with which almoſt every philoſopher has been branded by contemptible writers. It availed him nothing that he had exhauſted his genius in collecting proofs of the exiſtence of a God, and in ſearching for new ones. His enemies compared him to Vanini,

in

in one of the pieces they publiſhed againſt him; not that Vanini was really an atheiſt, the contrary has been demonſtrated; but he was burnt as ſuch, and they could not have made a more ſhocking compariſon. Deſcartes found great difficulty to obtain a very ſlight ſatisfaction, by a decree of the academy of Groninguen. His Meditations, his Diſcourſe on Method, are ſtill in eſteem; his natural philoſophy is entirely fallen, being founded neither on geometry nor experiments. He was a long time in poſſeſſion of ſo prodigious a reputation, that la Fontaine, who knew nothing of the matter, indeed, but was the eccho of the public voice, ſaid of him,

Deſcartes ce mortel dont on eût fait un Dieu,
Dans le ſiécles paſſés, & qui tient le milieu
Entre l'homme & l'eſprit, comme entre l'huitre & l'homme,
Le tient tel de nos gens franche bête de ſomme.

Deſcartes, in ages paſt, had been
Ador'd as God. He rank'd between
Pure ſoul and man immur'd in cloiſter,
As human brutes 'twixt man and oiſter.

The abbé Genet, a writer of the preſent century, has unfortunately been at the pains to tranſlate Deſcartes's natural philoſophy into French verſe.

It is only ſince the year 1730, that France has begun to recover from the errors of that chimerical philoſophy, and ſince that experimental philoſophy and geometry have been cultivated. Deſcartes has had the ſame fate in natural

tural philoſophy, as Ronſard had in poetry. He died at Stockholm, in 1650.

Deſmarets de St. Sorlin (John) was born at Paris, in 1595. He had a great ſhare in writing cardinal Richelieu's tragedy of Mirame. His comedy of the Viſionaries paſſed for a maſter-piece, but this was before Moliere appeared. He was comptroller-general extraordinary of war, and ſecretary of the marine in the Levant. Towards the latter part of his life, he became more known for his fanaticiſm than his productions. He died in 1676.

Domat, a famous civilian. His book on civil law met with great approbation.

Dougat (John) was born at Toulouſe, in 1639. He was a civilian, and a man of letters. He every year had a child by his wife, and compoſed a book. The ſame is ſaid of Tiraqueau. The Journal des Scavans calls him a great man, but this is a title not to be laviſhed. He died in 1688.

Dubois (Gerard) was born at Orleans, in 1629. He was of the oratory. He compoſed the Hiſtory of the Church of Paris. He died in 1696.

Duché was valet de chambre to Lewis XIV. He made ſome tragedies for the court, taken from holy writ, like Racine, but not with equal ſucceſs. His opera of Iphigenia at Tauris, is his beſt piece. It is wrote in the ſublime taſte; and, though it is but an opera, it affords a ſtrong idea of the beſt things in the Greek tragedies. This taſte did not laſt long, and ſoon after we were reduced to ſimple ballets, conſiſting of detached acts, made ſolely for the ſake of introducing the dances; thus, even the opera

opera began to degenerate, at the time that almoſt every other theatrical production was upon the decline.

Madame de Maintenon made the fortune of this author, by recommending him in ſuch ſtrong terms to monſieur de Pontchartrain, ſecretary of ſtate, that, ſuppoſing him to be a perſon of ſome conſideration, the miniſter went to pay him a viſit. When Duché, who at that time lived very obſcurely, ſaw a ſecretary of ſtate enter his houſe, he thought it was to carry him to the Baſtile.

Ducheſne (Andrew) was born at Touraine, in 1584. He was hiſtoriographer to the king, and author of ſeveral hiſtorical tracts and genealogical enquiries. He was called the father of French hiſtory. He died in 1640.

Dufrénoi (Charles) was born at Paris, in 1611. He was both painter and poet. His poem on painting has been greatly applauded by thoſe who can read other Latin verſes than thoſe of the Auguſtan age: he died in 1665.

Dufrény (Charles) was born at Paris, in 1648: he paſſed for the grandſon of Henry IV. whom he reſembled: he was valet of the wardrobe to Lewis XIV. as his father had been to Lewis XIII. his royal maſter was continually giving him ſome marks of his bounty, notwithſtanding his diſorderly way of life, but all could not keep him from dying poor. Though he had a great ſhare of wit, and was not confined in his talents, he never could compoſe a regular piece. We have ſeveral comedies of his writing, in every one of which there are ſome pretty and ſingular ſcenes: he died in 1724.

Dupleix (Scipio) of Cardom. Tho' this writer was born in 1559, yet he may be reckoned in the Age of Lewis XIV. as he was living in his reign: he was the firſt hiſtorian who quoted his authorities in the margin of his work, which is a precaution abſolutely neceſſary in thoſe who do not write the hiſtory of their own times, unleſs they confine themſelves to well known facts: his hiſtory of France is no longer read; there having been others much better digeſted, and written ſince his time: he died in 1661.

Eſprit (James) was born at Béziers, in 1611: he wrote a book On the Fallacy of Human Virtue, which is only a commentary on the duke of Rochefoucault. Chancellor Seguier, who had a good opinion of his learning, gave him a patent of counſellor of ſtate: he died in 1678.

Eſtrades (Marſhal d'). His letters are in as great eſteem as thoſe of cardinal d'Oſſat, and it is a circumſtance peculiar to the French, that their ſimple diſpatches have frequently been excellent works: he died in 1686.

La Fare (the marquis of). He is well known by his Memoirs, and ſome agreeable verſes: his talent for poetry did not diſcover itſelf till he was in his ſixtieth year. It was in praiſe of madame de Cailus, one of the moſt amiable women of the age, both for wit and beauty, that he firſt exerciſed his muſe; and his verſes on that lady are, perhaps, the moſt delicate of any he has compoſed.

Mabas-

M'abandonnant un jour à la triſteſſe,
Sans eſpérance, & même ſans déſirs,
Je regrettais les ſenſibles plaiſirs
Dont la douceur enchanta ma jeuneſſe.
Sont-ils perdus, diſais-je, ſans retour?
Et n'es-tu pas cruel, amour!
Toi que j'ai fait dès mon enfance,
Le maître de mes plus beaux jours,
D'en laiſſer terminer le cours
A l'ennuyeuſe indifference?
Alors j'aperçus dans les airs
L'enfant maître de l'Univers,
Qui plein d'une joie inhumaine
Me dit en ſouriant, Tircis, ne te plain plus,
Je vai mettre fin à ta peine,
Je te promets un regard de Cailus.

Indulging once a melancholly vein,
Depriv'd of hope and even without deſire,
I ſigh'd to think of that gay, pleaſing fire,
Which fluſh'd with rapture, youth's enchanting reign!
And are theſe tender joys for ever flown?
Ah! cruel love ſo early known,
My prime of manhood own'd thy pow'r intenſe;
If then the zenith of my days was thine,
Ah! leave me not a prey in life's decline,
To vacant thought and cold indifference.
Then hov'ring in the nether ſky,
The world's great maſter, Love, I ſpy;
Who, ſmiling with inhuman glee,
Said, prithee Thirſis ceaſe to wail,
More happy days thou ſtill ſhalt ſee;
A glance of Cailus ſhall thine heart regale.

He died in 1713.

La Fayette (Mary Magdalen de la Vergne, counteſs of). Her princeſs of Cleves, and her Zaide, were the firſt romances in which the manners of polite life, and natural adventures appeared, deſcribed with elegance. Before her they wrote only a heap of impoſſibilities, in a bombaſt ſtile. She died in 1693.

Félibien (Andrew) was born at Chartres, in 1619: he was the firſt who gave the title of Great to Lewis XIV. in the inſcriptions in the town-houſe of Paris: his Diſcourſes on the Lives of the Painters, was that, of all his works, which did him the moſt honour: he is elegant, profound, and ſhews great taſte; but he makes uſe of too many words to ſay a few things, and is abſolutely void of method: he died in 1695.

Fénelon (Francis de Salignac) archbiſhop of Cambray, was born at Perigord, in 1651. We have fifty-five different productions of his, all of which ſeem to come from a heart full of virtue, but his Telemachus eſpecially inſpires that virtue: he has been in vain condemned by Gueudeville and the abbé Faidit: he died at Cambrai, in 1715.

After the death of Fenelon, Lewis XIV. burnt, with his own hand, all the manuſcripts which the duke of Burgundy had preſerved of his preceptor's. Ramſay, who was brought up under this celebrated prelate, wrote to me in theſe words: "Had he been born in England, his genius would have diſcovered itſelf more ſtrongly; and he would, without fear, have given full ſcope to his principles, which no one was acquainted with."

Ferrand, counſellor of the court of Aids. We have ſome pretty verſes of his writing: he joined with Rouſſeau in the Epigram and Madrigal. The following is a ſpecimen of the taſte in which Ferrand wrote.

D'amour & de mélancolie
Célemnus enfin conſumé,
En fontaine fut transformé;
Et qui boit de ſes eaux, oublie
Juſqu'au nom de l'objet aimé;
Pour mieux oublier Égérie,
J'y courus hier vainement:
A force de changer d'amant
L'infidéle l'avoit tarie.

Celemnus waſted to the marrow,
By blaſted love and moping ſorrow,
Was to a fountain chang'd by fate,
Whoſe waters drank, obliterate
All traces from the lover's mind,
Of ſwains untrue, or nymphs unkind.
Thither Egeria to forget,
By drinking eagerly, I fly
But lo! the fickle vain coquet,
Herſelf had drank the fountain dry.

By this we may perceive that Ferrand wrote upon ſubjects of gallantry with more nature, eaſe, and delicacy; and that Rouſſeau was more forcible and ſtudied in licentious ones.

Feuquiéres de Pas, (the marquis of) was born at Paris in 1648: he was an officer of conſummate knowledge in the art of war, and an excellent guide, if he was not at the ſame time too ſevere a critic: he died in 1711.

Le Fevre (Tanegui) was born at Caën in Normandy, in 1615: he was a Calviniſt, and profeſſor at Saumur: he deſpiſed thoſe of the ſect, though he lived amongſt them: he was more the philoſopher than the Huguenot; he wrote as well in Latin as a perſon can write in a dead language, and made ſome Greek verſes, which apparently have had very few readers. The chief obligation which the learned world has to him, is being the father of madame Dacier: he died in 1678.

Le Fevre (Anne) madame Dacier. She was born in the Calviniſt faith, at Saumur, in 1651, and is famous for her great learning. The duke of Montauſier employed her in one of thoſe books which were called the Dauphin's, for the education of that prince. Florus, with Latin notes, is her's: her tranſlation of Terence and Homer have done her immortal honour: her only fault was, a too great fondneſs for her own tranſlations. La Motte attacked her with wit, and ſhe replied with erudition. She died at the Louvre in 1720.

Flechier (Eſprit) of the country of Avignon, was born in 1632, and was biſhop of Lavaur, and afterwards of Nimes. He was born a French and Latin poet, an hiſtorian, and a preacher; but he is chiefly known by his fine funeral orations. He compoſed his hiſtory of Theodoſius for the uſe of the dauphin. The duke of Montauſier engaged the beſt ſcholars of France, to employ their talents in productions for the education of his royal pupil. Flechier died in 1710.

Fleury (Claud) was born in 1640. He was ſubpreceptor to the duke of Burgundy, and confeſſor

feſſor to Lewis XV. his ſon. He lived at court in retirement and labour. His hiſtory of the church is the beſt that was ever written; and the preliminary diſcourſes are ſtill far ſuperior to his hiſtory. Theſe are in a philoſophical taſte; but his hiſtory is not. He died in 1723.

La Fontaine (John) was born at Chateau-Thierry in 1621. He was the moſt plain and ſimple man living, but admirable in his way, tho' negligent and unequal. He was the only good writer of his time who did not partake of the bounties of Lewis XIV. tho' entitled to them by his merit and his poverty. His fables are for the moſt part infinitely ſuperior to any that have been written before or ſince, in any language whatſoever. In the tales which he imitated from Arioſto, he wants that writer's elegance and purity; he falls far ſhort of him in his deſcriptions, which defect eſcaped Boileau in his Diſſertation on Joconde, becauſe he did not underſtand Italian: but in thoſe tales which he has taken from Boccace, La Fontaine is ſuperior, as having a much greater ſhare of wit, elegance, and art, than the Italian, whoſe only merit is ſimplicity, perſpicuity, and exactneſs of language, but La Fontaine corrupted the French. He died in 1695.

Fontenelle (Bernard Bouvier de.) Though he was living in 1756, yet he muſt be an exception to the rule we have laid down for ourſelves of not admitting any living perſon into this catalogue, his great age, being near an hundred when he died, ſeems to demand this diſtinction. He is at preſent equally above panegyric and criticiſm. He may be conſidered as the moſt univerſal genius that the age of Lewis XIV. produced, and may be reſembled to a ſoil that from its

happy situation bears every kind of fruit. He was not twenty years of age, when he composed the greatest part of the tragic opera of Bellerophon; after which he wrote his opera of Thetis and Peleus, in which he has greatly imitated Quinault. It was performed with great success; but his Æneas and Lavinia was not so well received. He tried his powers in tragedy, and assisted mademoiselle Bernard in some of her pieces. He composed two, one of which was played in 1680, but never printed. This piece drew upon him for a long time very unjust reproaches; for he had merit enough to be sensible, that notwithstanding his extensive genius, he was not possessed of the talents of his uncle Peter Corneille for tragedy. He wrote several detached pieces, in which there appeared a depth of knowledge and ingenuity, that plainly discover a man superior to his own works. In his Dialogues of the Dead and in his verses we may remark the spirit of Voiture, but much more extensive and philosophical. His Plurality of Worlds was a performance singular in its kind. He had the art of making an agreeable book of the Oracles of Vandale. The delicate subjects which are touched upon in that work subjected him to some underhand persecutions, which however he had the good fortune to get the better of. He perceived how dangerous it is to be in the right in those things where men of power and interest are in the wrong. He then applied himself to geometry and natural philosophy, in which he succeeded with as much ease as he had done in the more pleasing arts. Being appointed perpetual secretary to the academy of sciences, he exercised that employ for upwards of forty years with

universal approbation. In his history of that academy, he frequently throws a strong light upon the most obscure memoirs. He was the first who introduced that elegant manner of treating the sciences. If he is in some places too flowery, we should consider them as rich harvests wherein flowers naturally grow up with the corn.

His history of the Academy of Sciences would be as useful as it is judiciously executed, if his only task had been to give an account of truths brought to light; but he was obliged to explain different opinions that contradicted each other, and which are for the most part destroyed.

The elogiums which he pronounced on the deceased members of the Academy have the singular merit of rendering the sciences respectable, and of establishing the merit of the author. In vain have the abbé des Fontaines, and others of his stamp, attempted to obscure his reputation; it is the property of great men to have contemptible enemies. Notwithstanding his having lately published a few indifferent comedies, and an Apology for the Vortices of Descartes, we will readily pardon the faults in his dramatic pieces, on account of his great age; and his Cartesian principles, in consideration of those antient opinions having been when he was young the general received ones of all Europe.

In a word, he is considered as the head of those who have the pleasing art of throwing new lights and graces upon the abstract sciences. He has likewise great merit in every other species which he has undertaken. These great

talents were supported by a knowledge of languages and history; and he was without contradiction superior to all the learned men who have not had the gift of invention.

Forbin (Claud, chevalier de.) He was chef-d'escadre, or commodore in the French navy, and high-admiral to the king of Siam. He has left some curious memoirs, which have been digested and published, by which a judgment may be formed between him and Gué Trouin.

La Fosse (Anthony) was born in 1658. Manlius is his best dramatical piece. He died in 1708.

Fraquier (Claud) was born at Paris in 1666. He was well versed in literature, and had a great share of taste. He wrote only a few Latin verses, and some dissertations. He died in 1728.

Furetiere (Anthony) was born in 1620. He was famous for his dictionary and his disputes. He died in 1688.

Gaçon (Francis) was born at Lyons in 1667. Father Niceron has given him a place in his catalogue of illustrious men, tho' he was never famous for any thing but some bad satires. He had a great share in that collection of gross jokes, called *Brevets de la calotte*. These indecent productions took their rise from a certain society, called the regiment of fools, and of the calotte. This is certainly no part of good taste. These works, and their authors, are held in the utmost contempt by all well-bred people, and are never quoted but to inspire an abhorrence of their examples. He died in 1725.

Galant (Anthony) was born in Picardy, in 1646. He learned the Oriental languages at Constantinople, and translated part of the Ara-

bian

Iian tales, known by the title of the hundred and one nights. He died in 1715.

Gallois (John, abbot of) was born at Paris, in 1632. He was a man of univerſal learning, and the firſt who worked at the *Journal des ſcavans*, with the counſellor-clerk Sallo, who firſt formed the plan of that work. He afterwards taught Colbert, the miniſter of ſtate, a little Latin; who, notwithſtanding his many occupations, thought he had time enough to ſpare for learning that language. He took the greateſt part of his leſſons in his coach, in his journies from Verſailles to Paris. It is ſaid he did it with a view of being made chancellor, which is not unlikely. It is worthy of obſervation, that the two perſons, who were the greateſt patrons of learning, namely, Lewis XIV. and Monſieur Colbert, neither of them underſtood Latin. He died in 1707.

Gaſſendi (Peter) was born in Provence, in 1592. He was the reſtorer of part of the Epicurean ſyſtem of natural philoſophy. He perceived the neceſſity of atoms, and of a vacuum; and what he affirmed, Newton and others have ſince demonſtrated. He was not in ſo great reputation as Deſcartes, becauſe he was more rational, and no inventor of hypotheſes: nevertheleſs he was accuſed of atheiſm, as well as Deſcartes. Some imagined, that he who would, with Epicurus, admit a vacuum; would, like him, deny the exiſtence of a God. This is the way of reaſoning of all detractors and calumniators. In Provence, where there was no one jealous of him, Gaſſendi was called the holy prieſt. At Paris, the voice of envy gave him the title of atheiſt. It is true that he was a

ſceptic, and that philoſophy had taught him to doubt of every thing, but not of the exiſtence of a ſupreme being. He died in 1656.

Gédouin, canon of the holy chapel at Paris. He was author of an excellent tranſlation of Quintilian and Pauſanias. He died in 1744.

Le Gendre (Lewis) was born at Rouen, in 1655. He has compoſed a hiſtory of France: To execute ſuch a taſk well, requires the pen and freedom of the preſident de Thou, and even then it would be difficult to render the firſt ages intereſting. He died in 1733.

Geneſt (Charles Claud.) He was born in 1635: he was almoner to the dutcheſs of Orleans, and both a philoſopher and a poet: his tragedy of Penelope is ſtill played with ſucceſs, and is the only one of his dramatic pieces that has kept its ground on the ſtage: his laborious work of Deſcartes's philoſophy in verſe, or rather in rhime, is a greater proof of his patience than his genius; and he reſembled Lucretius in nothing but having verſified a philoſophy erroneous in almoſt every part of its ſyſtem: he partook of the bounty of Lewis XIV. died in 1719.

Girard (abbé). His book of Synonima is a very uſeful work, and will laſt as long as language, and even contribute to preſerve it.

Godeau (Anthony). He was one of thoſe who helped to eſtabliſh the French Academy: he was a poet, an orator, and an hiſtorian. It is well known that for the ſake of a pun, and in reward for his having rendered the *Benedicite* into verſe, cardinal Richelieu gave him the biſhopric of Graſſe: his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory in proſe is more valued than his poem on the Church

Church Calendar: he was greatly deceived in thinking to equal the Faſti of Ovid; neither his ſubject nor his genius being ſufficient for it. It is a great miſtake to think ſubjects of Chriſtianity as fit for poetry as thoſe of Paganiſm, whoſe mythology, as pleaſing as it was falſe, animated all nature; he died in 1672.

Godefroi (Theodore) ſon to Denis, or Dionyſius Godefroi, the Pariſian: he was born at Geneva in 1580: he was a learned man, and hiſtoriographer of France in the reigns of Lewis XIII. and XIV. he applied himſelf particularly to titles and ceremonies: he died in 1649.

Godefroi (Dennis) his ſon, was born at Paris in 1615: he was hiſtoriographer of France as well as his father: he died in 1681.

Gombauld (John Ogier de). Though born in the reign of Charles IX. he lived a long time after Lewis XIV. came to the crown. There are ſome good epigrams of his, of which a few ſtill continue to be repeated. He died in 1666.

Gomberville (Marin) was born at Paris in 1600. He was one of the firſt members of the academy. He wrote ſome voluminous romances before the reign of good taſte, and his reputation died with him in 1674.

Gondi, (John Francis) Cardinal de Retz, was born in 1613. He lived like Cataline in his youth, and Atticus in his old age. Several paſſages in his memoirs are worthy Salluſt; but the whole is not alike good. He died in 1679.

Gourville, from valet de chambre to the duke of Rochefoucault, became his friend, and even that of the great Condé. He was at the ſame time hanged in effigie at Paris, and appointed the king's

king's envoy in Germany, and afterwards propoſed as ſucceſſor to the great Colbert in the miniſtry. We have memoirs of his life, written by himſelf, in a natural and unaffected ſtile, wherein he ſpeaks of his birth and fortunes with indifference.

Le Grand (Joachim) was born in Normandy in 1653. He was a pupil of father le Cointe. He is one of the moſt profound hiſtorians we have. He died in 1732.

Grécour, Canon of Tours. His poem of Philotanus had prodigious ſucceſs. The chief merit of theſe kinds of pieces is generally in the choice of the ſubject, and the maliciouſneſs of the human heart: not but that there are ſome good verſes in this poem. The beginning is extremely happy, but the end is not at all anſwerable. The devil does not ſpeak near ſo pleaſantly as when he is firſt introduced. The ſtile is low, uniform, void of dialogue, grace, ingenuity, purity, imagination, or expreſſion; and in ſhort is only a ſatirical hiſtory of the bull Unigenitus in burleſque verſe, of which ſome lines are extremely diverting.

Guerret (Gabriel) was born at Paris in 1641. He was known in his time by his Parnaſſus reformed, and his war of the authors. He had taſte; but his diſcourſe "Whether the empire of eloquence is greater than that of love," muſt not be taken as a proof of it. He compoſed the journal du Palais, in conjunction with Blondeau. This journal is a collection of arrets of the French parliaments, which are frequently different decrees in cauſes of the ſame nature. Nothing is a ſtronger proof how much our practice of law

ſtands

stands in need of being preferred than that there is a necessity of collecting decrees. He died in 1688.

Du Guet (James Joseph) was born at Forez, in 1649. He was one of the best writers the Jansenists had in their party. His book on the education of a king was not composed for the king of Sardinia, as has been said: it was finished by another hand. Du Guet has formed his stile on that of the best writers of Port-Royal. He might like them have done great service to literature. Three volumes upon five and twenty chapters of Isaiah, plainly shew that he was no niggard of his time nor pen. He died in 1733.

Du Gue-Trouin, from a private adventurer became lieutenant-general of the naval forces of France. He was one of the greatest men in his way. He has left us memoirs written in the stile of a soldier, and very proper to excite emulation in his countrymen.

Du Halde, the Jesuit, without stirring out of Paris, or having ever seen China, has, from the memoirs of his fraternity, given the best and most ample description of the Chinese empire that is in the world. He died in 1743.

Our insatiable curiosity for knowing every minute particular relating to the religion, laws, and manners of the Chinese, is not yet satisfied: a burgomaster of Middlebourg, named Hudde, a man of great fortune, guided wholly by his curiosity, took a voyage to China, in the year 1700, where he laid out the greatest part of his fortune in informing himself of every thing. He became so perfect a proficient in the Chinese language, that he was taken for a native

native of that country: luckily for him his face favoured the miſtake. After ſome time he found means to be raiſed to the rank of a mandarin, in which quality he travelled through all the provinces, and at length returned to Europe, with a collection of forty years obſervations. Unhappily, the ſhip they were on board was caſt away, which was the greateſt loſs that ever befel the republic of letters.

Du Hamel (John Baptiſt) of Normandy, was born in 1624. He was ſecretary to the academy of ſciences. He was a philoſopher, and at the ſame time a divine. The improvements that have been made in philoſophy ſince his time, take away ſome part of the merit of his writings; but his name ſtill remains. He died in 1706.

Count Hamilton, (Anthony) He was born at Caen. He wrote ſeveral pretty pieces of poetry, and was the firſt who made romances in the comical taſte, which is widely different from the burleſque of Scarron. His memoirs of the count of Grammont, is of all productions of the kind that, wherein the ſlighteſt foundation is ſet off with the gayeſt, moſt lively, and moſt agreeable ſtile.

Hardouin (John) a Jeſuit, deeply learned in hiſtory; but chimerical in his notions. "We are not to enquire, ſays Montagne, who knows the moſt, but who knows the beſt." Hardouin carried his extravagance ſo far as to pretend that the Æneis and the odes of Horace were written by monks, in the thirteenth century. He will have it that Æneas is Jeſus Chriſt, and Horace's miſtreſs, Lalage, the chriſtian

ſtian religion. The ſame diſcernment which diſcovered to father Hardouin the Meſſiah in Æneas, made him likewiſe ſee atheiſts in the fathers Thomaſſin, Quênel, Mallebranche, Arnauld, Nicolle, and Paſcal. His folly took away all ſting from his calumny: but as all thoſe who revive this charge of atheiſm againſt men of learning, are not known fools, it may frequently prove dangerous. We have had inſtances of ſeveral who have abuſed their office, by uſing theſe arms, againſt which there is no ſhield, in order to work the ruin of perſons of merit, with a weak prince.

Hecquet. He was a phyſician. In the year 1722, he publiſhed his rational ſyſtem of Trituration, an ingenious theory, but does not account for the manner in which digeſtion is made. Other phyſicians have added, in their explanations, the gaſtric juice and the heat of the viſcera; but no one has been able to find out this ſecret of nature, who conceals herſelf in all her operations.

Helvetius, a famous phyſician, who has written excellently upon the animal oeconomy and fevers. He died in the year 1750.

Hénaut, known by his Sonnet of the Avorton, and ſeveral other pieces; and who would have acquired a great ſhare of reputation, if the three firſt cantos of his tranſlation of Lucretius that were loſt, had appeared, and written like what we have left of the beginning of that work. He died in 1682.

Poſterity muſt not confound this writer with another of the ſame name, but of much ſuperior merit, to whom we are indebted for the ſhorteſt

and

and beſt hiſtory of France; and perhaps for the only method in which all great hiſtories ought to be written for the future. For ſo great is the multiplicity of facts and documents, that we muſt very ſoon be reduced to extracts and dictionaries. But it will be very difficult to imitate the author of the chronological abridgment, who has gone to the bottom of ſo many things, and ſeemed at the ſame time only to touch upon them ſlightly.

Herbelot (Bartholomew) was born at Paris in 1625. He was the firſt Frenchman who thoroughly underſtood the oriental languages, and hiſtory. He was at firſt taken little notice of in his own country. Ferdinand II. grand duke of Tuſcany, received him with marks of diſtinction, and taught France to know his merit. Then he was recalled and encouraged by Colbert, who was the patron of all merit. His Bibliotheque Orientale is equally curious and learned: he died in 1695.

Hermant (Godfrey) was born at Beauvais in 1617: he was author of ſome polemical works, which periſhed with the diſputes that gave them birth: he died in 1690.

La Hire (Philip) was born at Paris in 1740: he was ſon to a good painter: he was himſelf a great mathematician, and contributed much to the famous French meridian: he died in 1718.

L'Hopital. (Francis marquis of) He was born in 1662: he was the firſt who wrote in France on the calculation of infinites found out by Sir Iſaac Newton. This was a prodigy at that time: he died in 1704.

D'Hoſier

D'Hoſier (Peter) was the ſon of an advocate, and born at Marſeilles in 1592: he was the firſt who cleared up the account of genealogies, and reduced them to a ſcience. Lewis XIII. made him gentleman in waiting, maſter of his houſehold, and gentleman in ordinary of his chamber. Lewis XIV. gave him a patent of counſellor of ſtate. Several truly great men have been much leſs rewarded. Their labours were not ſo neceſſary to human vanity: he died in 1660.

Des Houlieres. (Antonietta de la Garde) Of all the French ladies who have applied themſelves to poetry, no one has ſucceeded ſo well as this; for her verſes ſtill continue to be repeated by every one: ſhe died in 1694.

Huet (Peter Daniel) was born at Caen in 1630: he was a man of univerſal learning, and retained the ſame ardour for ſtudy till the age of ninety-one: he was invited to Stockholm by queen Chriſtina, and was afterwards one of thoſe illuſtrious perſonages who aſſiſted in the education of the dauphin, than whom no prince had ever ſo great maſters. Huet turned prieſt when he was forty years of age, and had the biſhopric of Avranche given him, which he afterwards reſigned, that he might be more at leiſure to purſue his ſtudies in retirement. Of all his productions, "The Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients, and the Origin of Romances," are the moſt read. His treatiſe on the weakneſs of the human underſtanding made a great noiſe, and ſeemed to contradict his "Evangelical Demonſtrations:" he died in 1721.

Ja-

Jaquelot (Iſaac) was born in Champagne in 1647: he was a Calviniſt, and paſtor at the Hague, and at Berlin. He has written ſome pieces on religion: he died in 1708.

Joli (Gui) counſellor at the Châtelet, and ſecretary to cardinal de Retz: he has left ſome memoirs, which are in compariſon with thoſe written by the cardinal, what the ſervant is to the maſter: but there are ſome curious particulars.

Jouvency, (Joſeph) a Jeſuit, was born at Paris in 1643. This is another of thoſe who have had the obſcure merit of writing in Latin, as well as can be done in our time. His book *de ratione diſcendi & docendi*, though very little known, is one of the beſt that has been written on the ſubject ſince that of Quintilian. In the year 1710, he publiſhed at Rome a part of the hiſtory of his order, in which he writes like a Jeſuit and one who had been at Rome. The parliament of Paris, who think very differently from Rome and the Jeſuits, condemned this book, in which is a defence of father Guignard, who had been condemned to be hanged by this very parliament for an aſſaſſination, committed on the perſon of Henry IV. by his ſcholar Châtel. It is very true that Guignard was in no wiſe an accomplice in this murder, and that he met with hard uſage from the parliament; but it is equally true that this ſeverity was neceſſary in thoſe unhappy times, when a part of Europe, blinded by the moſt horrible fanaticiſm, thought it an act of religion to murder the beſt of kings and the beſt of men. He died in 1716.

De

De L'Isle (William) was born at Paris in 1675; he reformed geography, which had for a long time stood in need of improvement: he changed the whole position of our hemisphere as to longitude: he taught geometry to Lewis XV. who has proved one of his best pupils: that monarch having composed, after the death of his master, a Treatise on the Course of Rivers. William de L'Isle was the first who had the title of chief geographer to the king. He died in 1726.

Labbe (Philip) was born at Bourges in 1607: he was a Jesuit: he has done great services to history: he has left seventy-three pieces of his writing. He died in 1667.

Le Laboureur (John) was born at Montmorency in 1623: he was gentleman in waiting to Lewis XIV. and afterwards almoner: his account of the voyage to Poland, which he made with the marshalless de Guébriant, the only woman that ever had the title, and executed the functions of an ambassadress plenipotentiary, is very curious. The historical remarks with which he has enriched the Memoirs of Castelnau have thrown a great light upon the history of France. The wretched poem called Charlemagne, was not written by him, but by his brother. He died in 1675.

Lainé, or *Lainez* (Alexander) was born in Hainault in 1650: he was an extraordinary poet, and some little pieces of his, very happily written, have been collected. A certain person, who was at great pains and expence to have a Mount Parnassus made in bronze, and covered with figures in relievo, of all the poets and musicians that came into his head, has placed Lainé

in

in the rank of the moſt illuſtrious. The only truly delicate verſes of his that we have, are thoſe written on madame de Martel.

Le tendre Apelle un jour dans ces jeux ſi vantés
Qu'Athénes ſur ſes bords conſacrait à Neptune,
Vit au ſortir de l'onde éclater cent beautés,
Et prenant un trait de chacune,
Il fit de ſa Venus le portrait immortel.
Hélas! s'il avait vû l'adorable Martel,
Il n'en aurait employé qu'une.

To Neptune when the Iſthmian games of yore,
Were ſolemniz'd on the Athenian ſhore,
An hundred nymphs in blooming youth array'd,
Upriſing from the wave, their charms diſplay'd.
From each a ſhining feature fam'd Apelles choſe,
And an immortal Venus from his pencil roſe:
But had Martel once met his raviſh'd eye,
Her heav'nly form alone would all thoſe charms ſupply.

It may not be known perhaps that theſe lines are a tranſlation of this beautiful paſſage in Arioſto,

Non avea da torre altra, &c. *

He died in 1710.

Lambert

---

* We ſhall give the whole ſtanza, for the entertainment of the reader. Arioſto, ſpeaking of Olympia, whom Orlando delivered from the ſea-monſter, ſays,

E ſe foſſe coſtei ſtata à Crotone,
Quando Zeuſi l'imagine far volſe,
Che per donea nel tempio di Giunone,
E tante belle nude inſieme accolſe,
E ch'è per una farne in perfezzione,
Da chi una parte, e da chi un'altra tolſe;

Non

Lambert (Anne Thereſa de Marguenat de Courcelles, marchioneſs of) was born in 1647, and was a lady of great wit and underſtanding. She has left ſome uſeful pieces of morality, written in an agreeable ſtile. Her treatiſe on Friendſhip ſhews her deſerving of having friends. The number of ladies who have been ſhining ornaments to this glorious age, is one of the greateſt proofs of the progreſs of human underſtanding.

La donne ſon venute in eccellenza,
Di ciaſcun' arte ove hanno poſto cura. Arioſt.

The ladies then to excellence attain'd,
In ev'ry curious art they choſe to learn.

He died at Paris in 1703.

Lami (Barnard) was born at Mons in 1640: he belonged to the oratory: he was learned in more than one ſcience: he compoſed his Elements of the Mathematics in a journey that he made on foot from Grenoble to Paris. He died in 1715.

Lancelot (Claud). He was born at Paris in 1615: he had a hand in ſeveral very uſeful pro-

---

Non avea da torre altra, che coſtei,
Che tutte le bellezze erano in lei.

And had Olympia to Crotona ſtray'd,
When Zeuxis firſt imagin'd his deſign,
That piece in Juno's ſane to be diſplay'd,
And many naked beauties did combine;
That in perfection it might be array'd,
From each to cull ſome lineament divine;
He would have fix'd his eyes on her alone;
For, ev'ry charm in her united ſhone.
Orland. Furiet. Cant. xi.

ductions

ductions of the recluſes of Port-royal, for the education of youth. He died in 1695.

De Larrey (Iſaac) was born in Normandy in 1638: his Hiſtory of England was much eſteemed before that of Rapin made its appearance; but his Hiſtory of Lewis XIV. had never any reputation. He died at Berlin in 1719.

Launai (Francis) was born at Angers in 1612: he was a civilian, and a man of letters: he was the firſt who taught the French law at Paris. He died in 1693.

Launoy (John) was born in Normandy in 1603: he was a doctor in theology: he was a laborious ſcholar, and an intrepid critic: he detected a great many errors in religion, particularly that relating to ſaints, whoſe exiſtence he denied. It is well known that the curate of St. Euſtachius ſaid, he always paid him the greateſt reſpect, for fear he ſhould take his St. Euſtachius from him. He died in 1678.

Lauriere (Euſebius) was born at Paris in 1659: he was a lawyer, and no one better underſtood juriſprudence and the origin of laws: he was the perſon who formed the collection of ordnances, an immenſe work which did great honour to the reign of Lewis XIV. and is a monument of the mutability of all human things. A collection of ordnances is only a hiſtory of variations. He died in 1728.

Le Clerc (John) was born at Geneva in 1657; but his family was originally of Beauvais: he was not the only learned man of his family, but he was the moſt learned: his *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, in which he has imitated Bayle's Republic of Letters, is his beſt performance: his greateſt merit is, that he came near to Bayle, whom

whom he had ſo frequently attacked: he wrote a great deal more than that great man; but he was not like him acquainted with the art of pleaſing and inſtructing at the ſame time, which is ſo much ſuperior to all ſcience. He died at Amſterdam in 1736.

Lemery (Nicholas) was born at Rouen in 1645: he was the firſt rational chemiſt, and the firſt who publiſhed a General Pharmacopœia. He died in 1715.

Lenfant (James) was born at Beauſſe in 1661: he was a Calviniſt paſtor at Berlin: he was more inſtrumental than any one in carrying the energy and beauties of the French tongue to the moſt diſtant parts of Germany: his Hiſtory of the Council of Conſtance, judiciouſly reviſed and elegantly written, will be a proof to lateſt poſterity how much good and evil may ariſe from theſe great aſſemblies, and that good laws may be produced even from the midſt of paſſions, ſelf-intereſt, and cruelty itſelf. He died in 1692.

Des Lions (John) was born at Pontoiſe in 1615: he was a doctor of the Sorbonne, a man ſingular in his way, and author of ſeveral polemical pieces: he attempted to prove that the rejoicings on the feaſt of the Epiphany or Twelfth Day were profane, and that the world was ſoon to be at an end. He died in 1700.

Le Long (James) was born at Paris in 1655: he was of the Oratory. His *Bibliotheque Hiſtorique de la France* is a very learned work, and of great utility, though it has ſome faults. He died in 1721.

Longepierre (Hilary-Barnard, baron of). He was born in Burgundy in 1658: he was maſter

of all the beauties of the Greek language; a very rare degree of merit in his time. We have ſome tranſlations by him in verſe of Anacreon, Sappho, Bion, and Moſchus: his tragedy of Medea, though unequally written, and too full of declamations, is far ſuperior to that of Peter Corneille: but Corneille's Medea was written before he was at the height of his reputation. Longepierre compoſed ſeveral other tragedies upon the model of the Greek poets, whom he has happily imitated in not blending love with ſubjects of terror and cruelty; but at the ſame time he has copied them in the tedioufneſs of their common places, and in the barrenneſs of action and intrigue, and not equalled them in beauty of elocution, which conſtitutes the greateſt merit of a poet. Though he wrote ſeveral other tragedies in the Greek taſte, he gave only Medea and Electra to the ſtage. He died in 1727.

De Longuerue (Lewis du Four) was born at Charleville in 1652: he was abbot of Jard. Beſides knowing all the learned languages, he was maſter of all thoſe ſpoken in Europe. A few years labour and application may be ſufficient to attain a middling knowledge of ſeveral languages; but it is the labour of a whole life to ſpeak one's own with purity and eloquence: he underſtood univerſal hiſtory; and it is ſaid, that he compoſed the Hiſtorical and Geographical Deſcription of antient and modern France. He died about the year 1724.

Longueval (James) a Jeſuit, was born in 1681: he compoſed eight volumes of the Hiſtory of the Gallican Church, which was afterwards continued by father Fontenay. He died in 1735.

De

De la Loubere (Simon) was born at Toulouſe in 1642, and ſent envoy to Siam in 1677: he has left us memoirs of that country, which are much better than his ſonnets and odes. He died in 1729.

Mabillon (John) was born in Champagne in 1632: he was a Benedictine: he had the office of ſhewing the treaſury of St. Denis, which he deſired to reſign, giving for his reaſon, "that he did not chuſe to mix fables with truth." He made ſeveral very learned reſearches, and was employed by Colbert in enquiring into antient titles. He died in 1707.

Maignan (Emanuel) was born at Toulouſe in 1601: he was a Minime friar, and one of thoſe who have learnt the mathematics without a maſter: he was a mathematical profeſſor at Rome, where this profeſſorſhip has ever ſince his time continued with the French Minims. He died at Toulouſe in 1677.

Maillet. He was conſul at Grand Cairo: there are ſome inſtructive letters of his, relating to Egypt, and ſome MS. pieces of bold philoſophy.

Maimbourg (Lewis) a Jeſuit, was born in 1610. There are ſome of his hiſtories ſtill read with pleaſure: he was too much cry'd up at firſt, and too much neglected at laſt. It is very remarkable that he was obliged to quit the order for having wrote in favour of the clergy of France. He died at St. Victor in 1686.

Mainard (Francis) preſident of Aurillac, was born at Toulouſe in 1634. He may be reckoned in the number of thoſe who uſhered in the age of Lewis XIV. There are ſeveral pieces of poetry of his remaining, all written with great eaſe

and purity: he is one of thoſe authors who has made the greateſt complaints of the ill fortune attending talents, not knowing that the ſucceſs of a good work is of itſelf a ſufficient recompence to an artiſt; that if princes and miniſters make a merit of rewarding this kind of deſert, there is ſtill greater merit in waiting for their favours without aſking; and that if a good writer is ambitious of an elevated fortune, he ought to be the architect of it himſelf.

Nothing is more commonly known than his beautiful ſonnet addreſſed to cardinal de Richelieu, and that miniſter's harſh reply, the cruel monoſyllable *rien* (nothing). The preſident Mainard, after he retired to Auriſlac, made the following lines, which deſerve to be as well known as his ſonnet.

Par vôtre humeur le monde eſt gouverné,
Vos volontés ſont le calme & l'orage,
Vous vous riez de me voir confiné
Loin de la Cour dans mon petit ménage:
Mais, n'eſt-ce rien que d'être tout à ſoi,
De n'avoir point le fardeau d'un Emploi,
D'avoir dompté la crainte & l'eſpérance?
Ah! ſi le Ciel, qui me traite ſi bien,
Avait pitié de vous & de la France,
Vôtre bonheur ſerait égal au mien.

To your caprice the willing world's reſign'd;
Both ſtorm and calm your will and pleaſure wait:
You laugh to ſee me in a farm confin'd,
And think me wretched in my humble fate.
'Tis ſomething ſtill my freedom to enjoy;
Nor groan beneath the weight of an employ;

O'er fear and hope a conqueſt to obtain.
Shou'd heav'n, whoſe rays on me propitious ſhine,
To you and France ſhew mercy once again,
Your happineſs would one day equal mine.

After the death of the cardinal he ſays in another piece, that the tyrant is dead, and yet he is not more happy. Had the cardinal been his benefactor, that miniſter would have been a God with him; but becauſe he gave him nothing he was a tyrant. This is too much like thoſe beggars who accoſt paſſengers with a "God bleſs your honour," and load them with curſes afterwards if they get no alms from them. Maynard's verſes were very beautiful; but it would have redounded more to his credit, had he lived without aſking or murmuring. The epitaph which he made for himſelf is in every one's mouth.

Las d'eſpérer & de me plaindre,
Des Muſes, des Grands & du ſort,
C'eſt ici que j'attends la mort,
Sans la déſirer ni la craindre.

Tir'd of complaints, of hope, and faith,
By fortune, friends, and Muſe forſaken,
I wait unmov'd th' approach of death,
Nor wiſh, nor fear to be miſtaken.

The two laſt lines are a tranſlation of the old Latin one,

Summum nec metuas diem nec optes.

Moſt beautiful moral verſes are but tranſlations. It is very common not to wiſh for death, very rare not to fear it; and it would have been very

great not to have even thought that there were ſuch things as great men in the world.

Maintenon (Frances d'Aubigné, Scarron, marchioneſs of). She is an author as well as madame de Sévigné, becauſe her Letters have been printed after her death. Both of theſe ladies wrote with a great deal of ſpirit, but of a very different kind. The Letters of madame de Sévigné are dictated by the heart and the imagination, and are more ſprightly and free. Thoſe of madame de Maintenon, more conſtrained, and ſeem as if ſhe had foreſeen they would one day be made public. Madame de Sévigné, in writing to her daughter, wrote only for that daughter. There are ſeveral anecdotes to be found in both theſe collections. We may perceive in thoſe of madame de Maintenon, that ſhe was married to Lewis XIV. that ſhe had conſiderable influence in ſtate affairs, but that ſhe did not direct them; that ſhe did not haſten the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and its conſequences, neither did ſhe oppoſe it; that ſhe ſided with the Moliniſts at firſt, becauſe Lewis XIV. did ſo, and that at length ſhe became ſeriouſly attached to that party; that Lewis XIV. in the latter part of his life, uſed to carry relicks about him; with ſeveral other private anecdotes. But the little knowledge that may be gained from this collection, is too dearly bought by the number of uſeleſs letters it contains; a fault which is common to all collections of this kind. If nothing was to be printed but what is uſeful, there would not be by an hundredth part ſo many bad books. She died at St. Cyr in 1719.

Malebranche (Nicholas) of the Oratory, was born at Paris in 1638. He was one of the deepeſt

eſt meditators that ever wrote. As he abounded with that forcible imagination which makes more diſciples than truth, he had his likewiſe in his time: there were thoſe that went by the name of *Malebranchians*. He has admirably ſhewn the errors of the ſenſes and imagination; but when he attempted to dive into the nature of the ſoul, he was loſt in the abyſs, as others had been before him. He was, like Deſcartes, a great man by whom very little was to be learnt. He died in 1715.

Malézieux (Nicholas) was born at Paris in 1650. The duke of Burgundy's Elements of Geometry are the leſſons that he gave to that prince. He raiſed himſelf a great reputation by his conſummate knowledge in literature, and the dutcheſs of Maine made his fortune. He died in 1727.

Mailleville (Claud de) one of the firſt members of the Academy. The ſingle ſonnet of the *Belle Matineuſe*, made a famous man of him; whereas ſuch a piece would be hardly thought worth ſpeaking of now a-days. But good productions in any kind were as rare then as they are ſince become common. He died in 1647.

De Marca (Peter) was born in 1594. Being left a widower with ſeveral children, he entered into the church, and was nominated to the archbiſhopric of Paris. His book entitled *La Concorde de l'Empire & du Sacerdoce*, is much eſteemed. He died in 1662.

De Marolles (Michael) was born at Touraine in 1600, and was ſon to the celebrated Claud de Marolles, captain of the guard of a hundred Swiſs, ſo well known for having engaged in ſingle combat with Marivaux, at the head of the

army of Henry IV. Michael, who was abbot of Villeloin, was author of ſixty-nine works, of which ſeveral were tranſlations, and very uſeful in their time. He died in 1681.

La Marre (Nicholas) was born in Paris in 1641. He was commiſſary of the châtelet: he was author of a piece ſuitable to his profeſſion, The Hiſtory of the Police, which is of uſe only to the people of Paris, and is better to conſult than to read. As a reward, he had a penſion aſſigned him out of the profits of the ſtage, which he never received. They might as well have aſſigned the comedians a penſion out of the wages of the city watch.

Du Marſais. No one better underſtood the metaphyſical part of grammar than himſelf, nor made more profound reſearches into the principles of languages. His book of *Tropes* is inſenſibly become neceſſary, and the whole of what he has written concerning grammar deſerves to be ſtudied. He was one of thoſe obſcure philoſophers with whom Paris abounds, who judge cooly and juſtly of every thing, living peaceably among themſelves, and keep up a rational commerce with each other, unknown to the great, and dreaded by the quacks of all kinds, who ſeek to lord it over weak minds. The number of theſe wiſe men is a conſequence of the ſpirit of the age. He died in 1755.

Marſollier (James) was born at Paris in 1657. He was one of the regular canons of St. Genevieve, and is known by ſeveral hiſtorical writings, which are well executed. He died in 1724.

Martignac (Stephen) was born in 1628. He was the firſt who made a ſufferable proſe tranſlation of Virgil, Horace, &c. I queſtion much whether

whether they can ever be happily rendered in verſe; for it is not enough to have their genius, the difference of the languages is an inſurmountable obſtacle. He died in 1698.

Maſcaron (Julius) of Marſeilles, was born in 1634. He was biſhop of Tulles, and afterwards of Agen. His Funeral Orations diſputed the prize with thoſe of Boſſuet at firſt; but now they ſerve only to ſhew how great a man the latter was. Maſcaron died in 1703.

Maſſillon was born in Provence in 1663. He belonged to the Oratory, and was biſhop of Clermont. No preacher had a better acquaintance with the world: he was more flowery and pleaſing than Bourdalouë; his eloquence was that of the courtier, the academic, and the man of wit; and what is more, he was a philoſopher, moderate in his opinion, and a friend to toleration. He died in 1742.

Maucroix (Francis) was born at Noyen in 1619. He was an hiſtorian, a poet, and a man of letters.

Menage (Giles), of Angers, was born in 1633. He has given an example, that it is much eaſier to write Italian verſes than French: his Italian poetry is eſteemed even in Italy itſelf, and our language is greatly indebted to his curious reſearches: he was an adept in more than one ſpecies of learning. He died in 1692.

Menetrier (Claud-Francis) was born in 1631. He has done great ſervice to the art of heraldry, emblems, and devices: he died in 1705.

Meri (John) was born at Berry in 1645. He was one of the moſt eminent illuſtrators of ſurgery, and has left ſeveral very uſeful obſervations. He died in 1722.

Mezerai (Francis) was born at Argentan in Normandy in 1610. His hiſtory of France is very well known; his other writings not ſo much. He loſt his penſions for ſaying what he thought was truth. In other reſpects, he was rather bold than exact, and his ſtile is unequal. He died in 1683.

Mimeures (the marquis of): He was favourite to monſeigneur the Dauphin, ſon to Lewis XIV. There are ſome little detached pieces of poetry of his, not at all inferior to thoſe of Racine and Mainard: but as they appeared at a time when good writing was very ſcarce, and the marquis de Mimeures lived in an age when that art was brought to its perfection, they gained great reputation, and the marquis was hardly known: his Ode to Venus, imitated from Horace, is not unworthy of the original.

Le Moine (Peter), a Jeſuit. He was born in 1602: his *Devotion aiſée* made him ridiculous; but he might have gained a great name by his *Louiſiade*. He had a prodigious fund of imagination: how comes it then he did not ſucceed? Becauſe he had neither taſte, nor a knowledge of the genius of his language, and wanted a rigid friend. He died in 1671.

Moliere (John-Baptiſte) was born at Paris in 1620 He was the beſt comic poet that any nation ever produced. This article led me to read over the comic poets of antiquity; and it muſt be confeſſed, that if we compare the art and regularity of our ſtage with the looſe and unconnected ſcenes of the ancients, their weak intrigues, and the indelicate cuſtom of making their actors relate, in long, inſipid, and improbable ſoliloquies, either what they had done, or what

what they were going to do; it muſt be confeſſed, I ſay, that Moliere drew comedy from its chaos, as Corneille did tragedy; and that the French are ſuperior, in this reſpect, to any nation under the ſun. Moliere, again, had another kind of merit to what either Corneille, Racine, Boileau, or la Fontaine poſſeſſed: he was a philoſopher, and ſuch both in theory and practice; and yet to this philoſopher was it that Harlai, archbiſhop of Paris, ſo deſpiſed on account of his morals, denied the empty honour of ſepulture; and the king himſelf was obliged to intercede with that prelate to permit Moliere to be privately interred in the church-yard of the little chapel of St. Joſeph, in the ſuburbs of Montmartre. He died in 1673.

The abbé *Mongaut*. The beſt tranſlation of Cicero's Letters that we have is by him: it is enriched with judicious and uſeful notes. He had been preceptor to the ſon of the duke of Orleans, regent of the kingdom.

La Monnoye (Bernard) was born at Dijon in 1641. He was an excellent literatiſt: he was the firſt who won the prize of poetry in the French academy, by his poem *du Duel aboli*, which is, very few excepted, one of the beſt poetical performances that has been produced in France. He died in 1732.

Monteſquieu (Charles), preſident of the parliament of Bourdeaux. He was born in 1689. At twenty-three years of age he publiſhed his Perſian Letters, a comic work, abounding with ſtrokes that ſhew an underſtanding more ſolid than his book. This work is an imitation of the *Siameſe* of Du Freny and the Turkiſh Spy; but ſuch an imitation as ſhews how the originals

ought to have been written. Theſe kind of performances ſeldom ſucceed but by the help of a foreign air; and a ſatire upon our own nation is better received from the pen of an Aſiatic than from that of a countryman, as what is common of itſelf, becomes by this means ſingular. The genius which reigns in the Perſian Letters opened the doors of the French academy to the preſident Monteſquieu, though that academy had itſelf been ill-treated in his book; but at the ſame time, the freedom with which he ſpeaks of the government, and of abuſes in religion, incurred the diſpleaſure of cardinal Fleury, who ordered them to be ſhut againſt him again. He fell upon an artful method of making that miniſter his friend: in a few days time he cauſed a new edition of his book to be printed off, in which he retrenched or ſoftened every thing that could appear exceptionable to him, either as a cardinal, or a miniſter of ſtate. Monſieur de Monteſquieu then waited upon his eminence in perſon with his book, who, though not much accuſtomed to read, peruſed ſome part of it. This air of confidence, ſupported by the good offices of ſome perſons of credit, won over the cardinal, and Monteſquieu was admitted into the academy.

After this he publiſhed his treatiſe on the Greatneſs and Fall of the Roman People; a worn-out ſubject, but which he made new by very ingenious reflections, and lively deſcriptions: ſo that it is a political hiſtory of the Roman empire. At length his Spirit of Laws made its appearance; a work in which there appears much more genius than either in Puffendorf or Grotius. We cannot read theſe authors without doing ourſelves ſome kind of violence; but we

rend

read the Spirit of Laws as much for amuſement as inſtruction. This book is wrote with as much freedom as the Perſian Letters; and this freedom did not a little contribute to its ſucceſs, by drawing upon him enemies, who increaſed his reputation by the hatred they brought upon themſelves. Theſe were a ſet of men, who, delighting in the obſcure factions of eccleſiaſtical controverſy, hold their own opinions as ſacred, and thoſe who deſpiſe them as impious and ſacrilegious. They wrote with great acrimony againſt Monteſquieu, and prevailed on the Sorbonne to examine his book; but the infamy and contempt with which his perſecutors were loaded, prevented that college from proceeding any farther. The principal merit of the Spirit of Laws is that love for the laws that reigns throughout the whole work, which love is founded on that for mankind. What is moſt extraordinary is, that the encomiums he gives to the Engliſh government is what pleaſed moſt in France. The ſmart and ſtinging irony againſt the Inquiſition, which is found in this work, charmed all the world, except the Inquiſitors: his reflections, which are almoſt always profound, he ſupports by examples drawn from the hiſtory of all nations. It is true, that he has been reproached with taking his examples too frequently from inconſiderable ſavage nations, in a manner unknown, and upon the accounts of travellers, whoſe fidelity there is too much reaſon to ſuſpect. He is not always very exact in his quotations: for inſtance, he makes the author of the Political Teſtament, aſcribed to cardinal Richelieu, ſay, "That if there ſhould be found among the people an honeſt man unfortunate, that man muſt not be employed;" whereas

whereas the Political Teſtament, in the place quoted, only ſays, that it is beſt to employ men of fortune and education, as the leaſt liable to be corrupted. The continual want of method throughout this work, the ſingular affectation of putting no more than two or three lines in a chapter, and that frequently, and thoſe lines nothing but a piece of pleaſantry, has diſguſted many readers, who complain of meeting ſometimes with ſallies of wit where they expected arguments. This author is likewiſe reproached with having advanced too many doubtful ideas for certain ones; but if he does not always inſtruct his reader, he always ſets him a-thinking, and that is no ſmall degree of merit. His lively and ingenious manner of expreſſion, in which we trace the imagination of his countryman Montaigne, has, above all, contributed to the great reputation of the Spirit of Laws: the ſame thing ſaid by a man of equal or even ſuperior learning to him, would not have been read. In ſhort, there is not any work in which there is more wit, and a greater number of learned ideas and bold things; or where a reader can find more opportunities for inſtruction, whether he approves or condemns his opinions. We may, with juſtice, rank this in the number of original works that were an ornament to the age of Lewis XIV. and which have no model in antiquity. He died in 1755, like a philoſopher, as he had lived.

Montfaucon (Bernard) was born in 1055. He was a Benedictine, and one of the moſt learned antiquarians in Europe. He died in 1741.

Montpenſier (Anna-Maria-Louiſa of Orleans), known by the name of Mademoiſelle. She was daughter to Gaſton duke of Orleans, and was born

born at Paris in 1627. Her Memoirs are rather those of a woman full of herself, than a princess who had been witness to great events; but there are several things very curious. She died in 1693.

Montreuil (Matthew de). He is one of those pleasing and easy writers, which the age of Lewis XIV. produced in great numbers, and who all succeeded in the middling way; but the spirit of the times, and imitation, have made many agreeable authors.

Moreri (Lewis) was born in Provence in 1643. It was little expected that the author of the Country of Love, and the translator of Rodriguez, would in his youthful days undertake the first Dictionary of Facts that had ever appeared. This laborious undertaking cost him his life. This work, which has been greatly improved and augmented, bears his name, but is no longer his. It is a new edifice, built upon the old plan. The many suspicious genealogies have greatly injured the character of this otherwise useful work. He died in 1680. There has been a supplement published, which is full of errors.

Morin (Michael-John-Baptist) was born at Beaujolois in 1583. He was a physician, a mathematician, and, through the prejudice of the times, an astrologer. He drew the horoscope of Lewis XIV. Notwithstanding his quackery, he was a man of learning. He died in 1656.

Morin (John) was born at Blois in 1591. He was very learned in the oriental languages, and in criticism. He died at the Oratory in 1659.

Morin (Simon) was born in Normandy in 1623. We mention him here only to deplore his fatal folly, and that of Saint-Sorlin Desmarets, his accuser.

cuſer. Saint-Sorlin was a fanatic, who informed againſt another. Morin, who deſerved only to be ſent to a mad-houſe, was burnt alive in 1663, before philoſophy had made ſufficient progreſs to prevent learned men from dogmatizing, and judges from being cruel.

La Motte-Houdart (Anthony) was born at Paris in 1672. He was famous by his writings, and amiable in his manners: he had many friends, that is to ſay, people who were pleaſed with his company; but I was with him in his laſt moments, and ſaw him expire without a creature by his bed-ſide. This was in 1731.

The ſole regard to truth obliges me here to tranſgreſs the uſual bounds of theſe articles.

This man, who was ſo gentle in his manners, and who never gave any one, when living, the leaſt ſubject of complaint, was, after his death, accuſed, almoſt in a judicial manner, of an enormous crime; no leſs than that of having been the author of thoſe horrible couplets which proved the ruin of Rouſſeau in 1710; and of having, for ſeveral years, directed the whole ſcheme that occaſioned the condemnation of an innocent man. This accuſation comes with ſo much more weight, as being made by a perſon who was intimately acquainted with the affair, and who drew it up in the nature of a laſt will and teſtament. N. Boindin, attorney-general to the treaſurers of France, when he died, in 1752, left behind him a very circumſtantial memorial, in which, after a ſilence of forty years, he accuſes La Motte-Houdart of the French academy, Joſeph Saurin of the academy of ſciences, and one Malafaire a merchant, of framing this villainous deſign, and the chatelet and the parliament

ment of having ſucceſſively awarded the moſt unjuſt ſentences. But,

Firſt, If N. Boindin was actually perſuaded of the innocence of Rouſſeau, why did he delay ſo long to make it known? At leaſt, why did he not publiſh it immediately after the death of his enemies; and why did he not preſent this memorial, which had lain written by him upwards of twenty years?

2dly, Is it not obvious, that Boindin's memorial is no other than a defamatory libel, and that this man entertained an equal hatred to every one whom he mentions in this information intended for poſterity?

3dly, He ſets out with facts which every one knows to be falſe. He pretends that the count de Nocé, and N. Melon, the regent's ſecretary, were aſſociates with Malafaire, a petty jewel-merchant. Every one who was acquainted with theſe people know this to be a flagrant calumny. He afterwards confounds N. la Faye, ſecretary of the king's cloſet, with his brother the captain of the guards. Laſtly, how can a jeweller be ſuppoſed to have had a ſhare in all this ſcheme of the couplets?

4thly, Boindin pretends that this jeweller, and Saurin the geometrician, joined with La Motte to prevent Rouſſeau from obtaining Boileau's penſion, who was ſtill living in 1710. Could it be poſſible for three perſons of ſuch different profeſſions to join together, and meditate ſo deep a ſcheme, one ſo infamous in itſelf, and ſo difficult in its execution as that of depriving a citizen, then in obſcurity, of a penſion which was not even vacant, that Rouſſeau would never have had,

had, and to which neither of the three aſſociates had any pretenſions?

5thly, After having agreed that Rouſſeau had written the five firſt couplets, which precede thoſe that occaſioned his diſgrace, he makes La Motte-Houdart ſuſpected as author of a dozen others in the ſame taſte; and, as the ſole proof of this accuſation, he ſays, that theſe twelve couplets, which were ſatires upon a like number of perſons who uſed to meet at the houſe of N. Villiers, were brought by La Motte-Houdart himſelf to that gentleman's houſe, an hour after Rouſſeau had been informed that the perſons in queſtion were to meet there. Now, ſays he, Rouſſeau had not above an hour's time to compoſe and tranſcribe theſe defamatory verſes. La Motte was the perſon who brought them to Villiers; therefore La Motte muſt be the author. On the contrary, methinks, his openneſs in carrying them thither might be a preſumption that he was not guilty of writing them. They were thrown at his door, as they were at thoſe of ſeveral other perſons: he opened the paper they were incloſed in, and found them full of the blackeſt invectives againſt all his friends, and himſelf likewiſe; upon which he immediately went and made the diſcovery. This has all the air of innocence.

6thly, It is neceſſary that thoſe who intereſt themſelves in this myſtery of iniquity ſhould be informed, that within little more than a month there had been a meeting of friends at the houſe of N. Villiers, moſt part of whom were the ſame perſons that Rouſſeau had already abuſed in five ſatirical couplets, which he had imprudently repeated to different people. The very firſt of theſe

theſe twelve new couplets ſufficiently ſhews, that the parties in queſtion uſed to meet ſometimes at the coffee-houſe, and ſometimes at monſieur de Villiers.

Sots aſſemblés chez de Villiers,
Parmi les ſots troupe d'élite,
D'un vil caffé dignes piliers,
Craignez la fureur qui m'irrite.
Je vai vous pourſuivre en tous lieux,
Vous noircir, vous rendre odieux.
Je veux que partout on vous chante;
Vous percer & rire à vos yeux
Eſt une douceur que m'enchante.

Ye fools, that grace the houſe of Villiers,
Imperial folly's choſen band,
Of a blind coffee-houſe the worthy pillars,
Revere and dread my chaſt'ning hand.
Your hated ſteps my vengeance ſhall purſue,
And drag your ſully'd fame to public view.
You ſhall be ſtigmatiz'd in ev'ry part:
To laugh and ridicule your motley crew
Shall be the darling pleaſure of my heart.

7thly, It is intirely falſe that the five firſt couplets, which were known to be Rouſſeau's, were only a ſlight piece of ridicule upon five or ſix private perſons, as the memorialiſt aſſerts. There is the ſame malignity in them as in the others.

Que le bourreau par ſon valet
Faſſe un jour ſarrer le ſifflet
De Berrin & de ſa ſequelle;
Que Pecqur qui fait le ballet
Ait le fouet au pied de l'échelle.

May Ketch, by dint of hempen rope,
The noiſy pipe of Berrin ſtop,
Of him and all his ſquawling train;
And may Pecour, who made the hop,
Be flogg'd 'till he is dy'd in grain.

Such is the ſtile of the five firſt couplets owned by Rouſſeau, and certainly this is not very delicate raillery. It is exactly in the ſame ſtile with the others which followed.

8thly, As to the laſt couplets, to the ſame air that, in 1710, occaſioned a proſecution to be brought againſt Saurin of the academy of ſciences, the memorialiſt ſays nothing more than what the printed caſe informed us of long ago; only he is of opinion, that the wretch who was ſentenced to be baniſhed, for having been ſuborned by Rouſſeau, ought to have been condemned to the gallies, if he had really given falſe teſtimony. In this, however, monſieur Boindin is miſtaken; for, in the firſt place, it would have been a ridiculous piece of injuſtice to have condemned the perſon ſuborned to the gallies, when only baniſhment was inflicted on the ſuborner: and in the ſecond place, this unhappy wretch did not appear as the accuſer of Saurin. Beſides, he could not have been abſolutely ſuborned; for he gave in ſeveral contradictory declarations; and the nature of his fault, and the weakneſs of his underſtanding, did not allow of an exemplary puniſhment.

9thly, N. Boindin gives us expreſly to underſtand in his memorial, that the family of Noailles and the Jeſuits aſſiſted to ruin Rouſſeau in this affair; and that Saurin employed all his credit and intereſt for that purpoſe. I myſelf know of a cer-

a certainty, and ſeveral perſons now living know it as well as myſelf, that neither the Noailles's family, nor the Jeſuits, ſolicited any ſuch thing. As to intereſt, that was at firſt intirely on the ſide of Rouſſeau; for, notwithſtanding that the general cry was againſt him, he had gained two ſecretaries of ſtate, namely, monſieur de Pontchartrain and monſieur de Voiſin, who were not at all intimidated by this cry. It was in conſequence of their orders, in form of ſollicitations, that the lieutenant-criminal, Le Comte, cauſed Saurin to be ſeized and thrown into priſon, interrogated, confronted, and croſs-examined, and all within four and twenty hours. The chancellor reprimanded the lieutenant-criminal, for ſo precipitate and unprecedented a procedure.

As to the Jeſuits, it is ſo far from being true that they declared themſelves againſt Rouſſeau, that immediately after the contradictory ſentence of the chatêlet, by which he was unanimouſly condemned, he retired to the noviciate of the Jeſuits, under the direction of father Sanadon, at the time he was appealing to the parliament. This retreat of his to the Jeſuits proves two things; firſt, that they were not his enemies; and ſecondly, that he wanted to oppoſe the ſhew of religion to the accuſation of libertiniſm brought againſt him. He had already written his beſt pſalms, at the ſame time with his licentious epigrams, which he called the *Gloria Patri* to his pſalms; upon which Danchet addreſſed him in the following lines:

A te maſquer habile,
Traduis tour à tour

. . . . . .

Petrone à la ville,
David à la Cour, &c.

In pious fraud ſo witty,
Tranſlating for thy ſport,
Petronius in the city,
And David's pſalms at court.

It would not, therefore, be in the leaſt ſurpriſing, that having, like many others, put on the cloak of religion, while he continued to wear that of the cynick, he ſhould have kept the firſt, which was now become abſolutely neceſſary to him. We ſhall draw no conſequence from this induction, as the heart of man is known to God alone.

10thly, It is of conſequence to obſerve, during upwards of thirty years, that La Motte-Houdart, Saurin, and Malafaire, lived after this proſecution, not one of them was ever ſuſpected of the leaſt wicked ſcheme, or the ſlighteſt ſatire. La Motte-Houdart never ſo much as made any reply to the black invectives contained in the Calotes, and other lampoons under different titles, with which one or two men, who were deteſted by all the world, loaded him for a long time. He never diſgraced his talents by ſatire; and when in 1709, after having been perpetually inſulted by Rouſſeau, he made this beautiful ode:

On ne ſe choiſit point ſon père;
Par un reproche populaire
Le ſage n'eſt point abatu.
Oui, quoi que le vulgaire penſe,
Rouſſeau, la plus vile naiſſance
Donne du luſtre à la vertu, &c.

The

The ſon his parent does not chuſe:
By groundleſs clamour and abuſe,
The wiſe will never be dejected.
Whate'er the vulgar may opine,
Rouſſeau, the meaneſt birth will ſhine,
By ſacred virtue's rays reflected.

When he wrote this piece, I ſay, it was rather as a leſſon of morality and philoſophy than a ſatire. He therein exhorts Rouſſeau, who deny'd his father, not to be aſhamed of his birth, and adviſes him to get the better of the ſpirit of envy and ſatire. Nothing can be more unlike that rage which breathes in the couplets of which he is accuſed.

But Rouſſeau, after his condemnation, which ſhould have made him more prudent, whether he had been innocent or culpable, could not get the better of his inclination. He frequently abuſed thoſe very perſons in epigrams whom he had attacked in his couplets, namely, La Faye, Danchet, La Motte-Houdart, &c. He made verſes againſt his old and new protectors, ſome of which are to be found in thoſe letters of his, which ſo ill deſerved to be made public; and moſt part of theſe verſes are in the ſame ſtile as the couplets, for which he was condemned by the parliament, witneſs the following againſt that illuſtrious muſician Rameau.

Diſtillateurs d'accords baroques,
Dont tant d'idiots ſon ferus,
Chez les Thraces & les Iroques
Portez vos Opera bourus, &c.

Ye that diſtil diſcordant ſtrains,
So grateful to an idiot ear,
Among the ſavage Indian ſwains,
Your inharmonious concerts bear.

Others in the ſame taſte are to be found in the collection entitled, Rouſſeau's Pocket-book, againſt the abbé d'Olivet, who had formed a ſcheme to have him recalled home. In ſhort, even in the latter part of his life, when he came to hide himſelf in Paris under the maſk of devotion, he could not forbear ſtill making theſe abuſive epigrams. It is true, that age had impaired his ſtile, but without reforming his diſpoſition, either becauſe by an unaccountable medley of opinions, not uncommon among men, he made this heinous ſpirit of abuſe a part of his devotion, or that by a wickedneſs no leſs common, this devotion was only hypocriſy.

11thly, If Saurin, La Motte, and Malafaire, had really plotted the crime of which they were accuſed, theſe three men having been afterwards upon very indifferent terms with each other, it is hardly poſſible but ſome part of their guilt muſt have tranſpired. This reflection, indeed, is not a proof; but, added to other circumſtances, it carries great weight.

12thly, If a fellow ſo rude and artleſs as that William Arnold, who was condemned as a witneſs ſuborned by Rouſſeau, had not been actually guilty, he would have declared his innocence: he would have publiſhed it aloud all his life, and to all the world. I knew the man: his mother was a kitchen maid in my father's family, as is ſaid in Saurin's factum; and both his mother and himſelf have acknowledged ſeveral

veral times in my preſence that he had been juſtly ſentenced. But why then, after two and forty years, and juſt as he was about to die, ſhould N. Boindin have left this ſtrongly atteſted accuſation againſt three perſons who were no longer living? The reaſon is this: he had drawn up this memorial above twenty years before; that is to ſay, Boindin had entertained a hatred to all three; that he could never forgive La Motte Houdart for not ſoliciting a ſeat for him in the French academy, and for having candidly declared to him, that the public profeſſion he made of atheiſm would prevent his being received. He had had a diſpute with Saurin, who was like himſelf, of an arrogant and inflexible diſpoſition, and alſo with Malaſaire, a rough and unpoliſhed man, and was at enmity with Legeret de la Faye, on account of the following epigram which he had made upon him.

Oui, Vadius, on connait vôtre eſprit,
Savoir s'y joint, & quand le cas arrive,
Qu' œuvre parait par quelque coin furtive,
Plus aigrement qui jamais la reprit?
Mais on ne voit qu'en vous auſſi ſe montre
L'art de louer le beau qui s'y rencontre,
Dont cependant maints beaux eſprits ſont cas.
De vos pareils que voulez-vous qu'on penſe?
Eh quoi, qu'ils ſont connaiſſeurs délicats?
Pas n'en voudrais tirer la conſéquence,
Mais bien qu'ils ſont gens à faire cent pas.

Yes, Vadius, that your wit is clear,
And learning ſolid I muſt own,
And ſhould ſome faulty work appear,
In finding flaws you yield to none:

But ſtill with all your ſenſe and ſpirit,
You want the art of praiſing merit,
Which every critic ſhould inherit.
Of ſuch as you what ſhall I ſay?
That they are connoiſſeurs immenſe;
But (take this caution by the way,)
I'd ſhun them like the peſtilence.

This was in fact Boindin's true character, and it is he who is deſcribed in the Temple of Taſte, under the name of Bardou. In his memorial he was the dupe to his hatred. He was a man incapable of ſaying what he did not think, and equally incapable of altering any opinion wherewith his humour inſpired him. In his morals he was irreproachable, in his life the ſtrict philoſopher; he did many generous actions; but that moroſe and unſociable humour of his, inſpired him with prepoſſeſſions which he could never overcome.

The whole of this fatal affair, the conſequences of which laſted ſo long, and with which no man is better acquainted than myſelf, took its riſe from the innocent amuſement which ſeveral perſons of merit took in meeting together at a coffee-houſe, where they did not always pay a proper regard to the principal law of ſociety, not to offend each other. Some ſevere criticiſms paſſed mutually between them; and what was at firſt only a breach of politeneſs, gave birth to laſting animoſity, and the perpetration of crimes. The reader now is left to judge whether there were three guilty perſons in this affair, or only one.

It is probable that Saurin might have been the author of the laſt couplets aſcribed to Rouſ-

ſeau

ſeal. It is probable likewiſe, that Rouſſeau having been found guilty of writing the five firſt, Saurin might have made the others, in order to ruin him; notwithſtanding there was no rivalſhip between them: but there is not the leaſt reaſon to charge La Motte with it. The intent of this article is purely to vindicate La Motte, whom I believe innocent. After all, it would be very difficult to determine which of the two, Saurin or Rouſſeau was guilty; but La Motte certainly was not.

De Motteville (Frances Bertaut) was born in Normandy in 1615. This lady has written ſome memoirs, which relate particularly to queen Anne, mother to Lewis XIV. in which we meet with ſeveral little facts written with great appearance of truth: ſhe died in 1689.

Le Nain de Tillemont (Sebaſtian) Son to John Le Nain, maſter of requeſts, was born at Paris in 1637. He was bred up under Nicole, and was one of the moſt learned writers of Port-Royal. His Hiſtory of the Emperors, and his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, in ſixteen volumes, are written with as much veracity as can be found in compilations from ancient hiſtorians; for hiſtory before the invention of printing, being liable to very little contradiction, was conſequently not very exact: he died in 1698.

Naudé (Gabriel) was born at Paris in 1690: he was a phyſician and a philoſopher; but more of the latter than the former. He at firſt attached himſelf to cardinal Barberini at Rome, then to cardinal de Richelieu, cardinal Mazarin, after that to queen Chriſtina, to whoſe court he ſometimes went. to increaſe the number of

learned men there; and laſt of all he retired to Abbeville, where he died as ſoon as he became at liberty. Of all his writings his Apology for the Great Men accuſed of Magic, is the only one remaining. A much larger volume might be made of Great Men accuſed of Atheiſm, ſince the time of Socrates.

——Populus nam ſolos credit habendos
Eſſe deos quos ipſe colit.

He died in 1653.

Nemours (Mary de Longueville, dutcheſs of) was born in 1625. There are memoirs of her's, in which we meet with ſome particulars relating to the unhappy times of the Fronde: ſhe died in 1707.

Nevers (Philip, duke of) There are ſome poetical pieces of his writing, in a very ſingular taſte. We muſt not judge of them by the ſonnet thus turned by Racine and Deſpreaux:

Dans un palais doré Nevers jaloux & bléme
Fait des vers où jamais perſonne n'entend rien.

In palace gilt, Nevers, ſo jealous and commanding,
Writes verſes that ſurpaſs all human underſtanding.

For his verſes are both very intelligible and very pleaſing, witneſs the following ones on Rancé, the famous reformer of La Trappe, who had written againſt archbiſhop Fenelon.

Cet Abbé qu'on croyait paitri de ſainteté,
Vieilli dans la retraite & dans l'humilité,
Orgueilleux de ſes croix, bouffi de ſa ſouffrance,
Rompt ſes ſacrés ſtatuts en rompant le ſilence,
Et contre un ſaint Prélat s'animant aujourdhui
Du fond de ſes deſerts déclame contre lui,
Et moins humble de cœur que fier de ſa doctrine,
Ill oſe décider ce que Rome examine.

That Abbé deemed ſo humble and ſo holy,
Grown old in cell and pious melancholy,
Proud of his croſs, elated with his yoke,
His ſacred vows, at length, and ſilence broke;
Now 'gainſt a blameleſs prelate he declaims,
And from his cloiſter poiſon'd arrows aims;
Leſs meek of heart than fluſh'd with learning's pride,
While Rome yet doubts, he ventures to decide.

His genius and talents are revived with improvement in his grandſon: he died in 1707.

Niceron (John Peter) a Barnabite monk, was born at Paris in 1685. He was author of the Memoirs of Illuſtrious Perſons in Literature. All his characters are not illuſtrious; but he ſpeaks of each in a ſuitable manner, and does not call a goldſmith a great man. He deſerves a place among the uſeful literati: he died in 1738.

Nicole (Peter) was born at Chartres in 1625: he was one of the beſt writers in Port-Royal. What he has written againſt the Jeſuits is no longer read; but his moral eſſays, which are of ſervice to mankind, will never be forgotten. That Chapter in particular which treats on the

means of preſerving peace in ſociety, is a maſter-piece unequalled by any thing of the kind among the ancients; but this peace is as difficult to be eſtabliſhed as the political one of the abbé de St. Pierre: he died in 1695.

D'Orleans, (Joſeph) a Jeſuit. The firſt who made choice of the revolutions of ſtates, as the only ſubject of hiſtory. Thoſe of England he has written in an elegant ſtile; but after the reign of Henry VIII. he is rather eloquent than faithful: he died in 1698.

Ozanam (James) a Jew by extraction, was born at Dombes in 1640: he learnt geometry without the help of a maſter at fifteen years of age. He is the firſt who compiled a Mathematical Dictionary. His Mathematical Amuſements have ſtill a great ſale: he died in 1717.

Pagi, (Anthony) a Franciſcan, was born in Provence in 1624. He corrected Baronius, for which he had a penſion from the clergy: he died in 1699.

Papin (Iſaac) was born at Blois in 1659: he was a Calviniſt; but having quitted that religion he wrote againſt it: he died in 1709.

Pardies (Ignatius Gaſton) a Jeſuit, born at Pau in 1638, known to the world by his Elements of Geometry, and his tract upon the Souls of Brutes. To pretend, with Deſcartes, that animals are meer machines, without ſenſation, though furniſhed with the proper organs, is directly to contradict reaſon and experience. On the other hand, to ſay they have ſouls, properly ſo called, is ſaying what cannot be proved: but to ſay they are endued with memory and ſen-

ſenſation, though the manner of their operation cannot be explained, would be ſpeaking like a man of judgment, who knows that it is better to be ignorant than to err; for what work of nature is there with whoſe firſt principles we are acquainted: he died in 1673.

Parent (Anthony) born at Paris in 1666: he was a good mathematician, though he never had been taught by any maſter: but what is ſtill more remarkable, he lived a long time at Paris independent and happy upon leſs than two hundred livres a year: he died in 1716.

Paſcal (Blaiſe). His father was the firſt intendant that was appointed at Rouen: he was born in 1623, and was a great genius, of the ſuperiority of which he thought of availing himſelf, in the ſame manner as kings of their power, that is, to bring every thing in ſubjection to him by main force. What in his Thoughts moſt diſguſts ſome readers is the contemptuous, authoritative air he aſſumes; but he ought firſt to have been ſure he had reaſon on his ſide. It muſt be owned that he contributed much to the improvement of our language, and eloquence. His enemies and thoſe of Arnauld found means to prevent any notice being taken of either in Perrault's book on Illuſtrious Men. This gave occaſion to the quoting and applying to them that paſſage of Tacitus: *Præfulgebant Caſſius & Brutus eo ipſo quod eorum effigies non viſebantur*: he died in 1662.

Patin (Gui) born at Houdan in 1601: he was a phyſician; but is better known by his Letters, which are full of ſlander and abuſe, than by his ſkill as a phyſician. Theſe Letters have been much read, on account of the anecdotes,

ſatire, and ſecret hiſtory in them, with which mankind in general are extremely delighted. It evidently appears from him how little cotemporary authors, who write the news of the day, can be depended upon as guides by an hiſtorian: for that news is often found to be falſe, or miſrepreſented through malice; beſides, all theſe little anecdotes cannot afford much entertainment, except to little minds: he died in 1693.

Patin (Charles) born at Paris in 1633, was the ſon of Gui. His works are read by the learned, as his father's Letters are by the idle and trifling. Charles was a very learned antiquarian; but he left France, and died profeſſor of medicine at Padua in 1693.

Patrau (Oliver) born at Paris in 1604. He is the firſt in whoſe pleadings we find any thing like purity of language. In his laſt illneſs, Lewis XIV. ordered him ſome money, being informed he was but poor: he died in 1681.

Pavillon (Stephen) born at Paris in 1632: he was attorney-general of the parliament of Metz, and writ ſome pretty pieces of poetry: he died in 1705.

Peliſſon Fontanier (Paul) a Calviniſt, born at Beziers in 1624. He was confident and ſecretary to the ſuperintendant Fouquet; was a very indifferent poet indeed, but very learned and eloquent. In 1661, he was confined in the Baſtile for his fidelity to his maſter, where he continued four years and a half. After his diſcharge he paſſed the remainder of his life in writing the moſt fulſome encomiums on the king, who had deprived him of his liberty. It is only in abſolute monarchies where ſuch an ab-

ject

ject ſervility and baſeneſs is to be found. More a courtier than a philoſopher, he quitted the religion in which he was educated, in order to make his fortune, in which he ſucceeded: for he roſe to be comptroller of accounts, maſter of requeſts, and abbé, and had a commiſſion to employ the third of the money granted to engage the Huguenots to follow his example in renouncing their religion. His Hiſtory of the Academy is much admired: but he writ a great many other things beſides that, as Prayers during Maſs, a Piece upon the Euchariſt, Pieces on Love and Gallantry, and love verſes in abundance to Olimpe, by whom was meant mademoiſelle des Vieux, who, it is ſaid, was married to the celebrated Boſſuet, before he took orders. But the performances that have done moſt honour to Peliſſon are his excellent Diſcourſes concerning M. Fouquet, and his Hiſtory of the Conqueſt of Franche-Compte. The Proteſtants pretend, that he died in a ſtate of indifference as to all religions, the contrary of which is aſſerted by the Catholics: his death happened in 1693.

Perrault (Claud) born at Paris in 1613: he was a phyſician, but preſcribed only for his friends. Without the aſſiſtance of any maſter, he became a great proficient in all the arts that have any dependence on deſign, and in mechanics. He was a good naturaliſt, and a great architect. He encouraged the arts under Colbert, their patron; and gained a reputation, in ſpite of Boileau: he died in 1688.

Perrault (Charles) born in 1626, brother of Claud. Being comptroller-general of the buildings under Colbert, he brought the Academies

of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture, into form and order. He was an encourager of men of letters, who made their court to him during the life of his protector, but afterwards abandoned him. He hath been charged with prejudice and injuſtice with regard to the Antients; but his great fault is the criticiſing them improperly, and without judgment, and making enemies of thoſe who could have defended his cauſe. The diſpute hath been and will be a long time a party-affair, as it was in Horace's days. How many are there in Italy, who, tho' they cannot read Homer with any pleaſure, but are in raptures when they read Taſſo or Arioſto; yet cry up the former as inimitable! he died in 1708.

Petau (Denys) born at Orleans in 1583, a Jeſuit. To him we are indebted for ſome corrections in chronology: he writ no leſs than ſeventy different pieces, and died in 1652.

Petit de la Croix (Francis.) He was one of thoſe whoſe merit the great Colbert encouraged and rewarded. At the age of ſeventeen, he was ſent by Lewis XIV. to Turkey and Perſia, to learn the oriental languages; and, what will appear a little extraordinary, he writ a part of the life of Lewis in Arabic, which is read and eſteemed in the Eaſt: he writ beſides, the Hiſtory of Genois-can and Tamerlane, compiled from ancient Arabian authors; and many other valuable tracts. But of all his performances his tranſlation of A Thouſand and one Day, is the moſt read.

L'homme eſt de glace aux verités,
Il eſt ne feu pour le menſonge.

Man-

Mankind to truth are cold as ice;
But ſoon take fire at lies and fiction.

He died in 1687.

Petit (Peter) born at Paris in 1615: he was a man of learning, and a philoſopher: his works are in Latin: he died in 1687.

Perron (Paul) born in Brittany in 1639: he was a great antiquarian, as appears from his tract on the origin of the Celtic language: he died in 1706.

Du Pin (Lewis) born in 1637, a doctor of the Sorbonne: he got much reputation, and ſome enemies by his *Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques*: he died in 1719.

La Placette (John) born in 1639, at Bearn: he was a proteſtant, and preacher in Holland, and at Copenhagen: he is the author of ſeveral works that are eſteemed: he departed this life in 1718, at Utrecht.

De Polignac (Melchior) cardinal, born at Velay in 1662; as good a Latin poet as it is poſſible for one that now writes in that language to be. In his own, he was very eloquent. It appears from his choice, as well as that of others, that it is eaſier to write in Latin verſe than in French. Unhappily for him while he oppoſed Lucretius, he oppoſed Newton: he died in 1741.

Porée (Charles) born in Normandy in 1675, a Jeſuit. One of the few profeſſors that have been known to and admired by the world in general: his eloquence reſembles that of Seneca: he was a poet and a wit; but his chief excellence and merit was making learning and virtue appear amiable to his puils: he died in 1741.

Du Pui (Peter): the ſon of Claud de Pui, counſellor of parliament, and a very learned man, was born in 1583. His learning was an advantage to the ſtate; for he was at great pains in ſearching and collecting charters, and other vouchers of the king's rights and prerogatives over ſeveral ſtates. He cleared up the Salic law as much as it is poſſible to do it, and ſhewed that the Gallican church has the juſteſt title to the liberties it claims, which notwithſtanding are but a part of the privileges of the ancient churches. It appears from his Hiſtory of the Knights Templars, that ſome individuals of the order indeed were culpable; but that the condemning of the whole order, and the puniſhment of ſo many knights, were acts of the moſt flagrant injuſtice: he died in 1652.

De Puiſegur (the marſhal.) He hath left us an Art of War, juſt as Boileau hath an Art of Poetry.

Quenel (Paquier) born in 1634, of the Oratory: he was unhappy in this, that he gave occaſion to a great diviſion among his countrymen: he lived in poverty and exile: his manners were ſevere, as thoſe of men wholly engaged in controverſy generally are. Thirty pages in his book changed or ſoftened, would have ſpared his country much diſpute, and animoſity; but then he would not have made ſo much noiſe: he died in 1719.

Le Quien (Michael) was born in 1691: a Dominican, and very learned. He took a great deal of pains in writing on the eaſtern church and that of England. In particular, he entered the liſts againſt Courayer concerning the validity

validity of ordination by Engliſh biſhops. But the Engliſh regard theſe controverſies no more than the Turks do ſuch as concern the Greek church. He died in 1703.

Quinault (Philip) born at Paris in 1635: he was auditor of accompts, and writ ſome very beautiful pieces of Lyric poetry, notwithſtanding Boileau's ſatire, which he bore with a great deal of good nature. Quinault was much ſuperior in his way to Lully. The former will always be read, whereas the latter, ſetting aſide his recitative, cannot even be ſung: yet in his own time he was ſuppoſed to be indebted to Lully for his reputation: but time tries all things. He partook, like many other great men, of the bounty of Lewis XIV. He died in 1688.

The marquis de Quincy, lieutenant-general of the artillery, and author of the Military Hiſtory of Lewis XIV. He is very minute in his details, which may be uſeful to thoſe that have patience to follow him through the operations of a campaign. Could exactly the ſame ſituations be ſuppoſed to exiſt, they would furniſh good examples, but that is never the caſe, neither in buſineſs nor war. The difference is always great, and the reſemblance imperfect. The conduct of war, like a game in which skill is requiſite, is only to be learned by practice and ſervice, and yet the event of a battle, like that of a game of hazard, is often determined by chance.

La Quintinie (John) born at Poitiers in 1626: he may be ſaid to be the inventor of the art of cultivating gardens, and tranſplanting trees. His merit was amply rewarded by Lewis XIV.

and

and all Europe now follows his precepts. He died in

Racine (John) born at Ferte-Milon in 1639, and educated at Port-Royal. When he writ the tragedy of Theagenes, and preſented it to Moliere, and that of the *Freres Ennemis*, with the ſubject of which Moliere furniſhed him, he was an eccleſiaſtic. In the patent to Andromache, he is ſtiled prior of Epinai. Lewis XIV. was not inſenſible to his great merit. He made him a gentleman in ordinary, nominated him ſometimes of his retinue when he went to Marli, made him lie in his apartment once during a fit of ſickneſs, beſides many other valuable marks of his favour: yet Racine died of chagrin, from an apprehenſion of his having incurred his diſpleaſure; by which it appears that he was a greater poet than philoſopher. The merit of his works was not aſcertained till of late. Mariamne, ſays St. Evremont, Sophonisba, Alcinoe, Andromache, and Britannicus are affecting pieces. Thus was not only Corneille's Sophonisba, a ſorry performance, but the abſurd Mariamne and Alcinoe ſet on a level with the other maſter-pieces. Thus is gold confounded with traſh during the lives of ingenious men, but death ſeparates them. He died in 1699.

Rancé (Jean de Bouthillier) born in 1626: his firſt performance was the tranſlation of Anacreon, and in 1664, he inſtituted the terrible reform of La Trappe. As legiſlator, he diſpenſed himſelf with the obſervation of that law, which obliged thoſe that are confined to that diſmal place, to be abſolute ſtrangers to what paſſes in the world. He was an eloquent wri-

ter.

ter. But, ſtrange inconſtancy! after he had inſtituted the above ſociety, and been its governor or ſuperior, he laid down the office, but afterwards would have reſumed it. He died in 1700.

Rapin (René) born at Tours in 1621: a Jeſuit. He is well known by the poem, called the Garden, in Latin, and many other learned pieces. He died in 1687.

Rapin de Thoiras (Paul) born at Caſtres in 1661: he was a refugee in England, and a long time an officer. The Engliſh are indebted to him for the only good and impartial hiſtory they have: for their own hiſtorians write all in the ſpirit of party. He died at Weſel in 1726.

Regis (Sylvan) born in Agenois in 1632: his philoſophical works are no longer regarded, in conſequence of the many diſcoveries and improvements that have been made ſince he wrote. He died in 1707.

Regnard (Francis) born at Paris in 1647: his travels alone were ſufficient to render him famous. He was the firſt Frenchman that viſited Lapland, where he left this inſcription cut out upon a rock: *Siſtimus hic tandem nobis ubi defuit orbis*, i. e. I am got at laſt to the extremity of the world. He was taken in the Mediterranean by a coſſair, and carried to Algiers, but was afterwards ranſomed and made treaſurer of France, and lieutenant of the waters and foreſts. He was a man of pleaſure and a philoſoper; his genius was ſprightly, and truly comic. His comedy called the *Joueur*, or Gameſter, is thought not inferior to thoſe of Moliere. One muſt be a great ſtranger to the genius of the two authors, to ſuppoſe that he ſtole that piece from

from Dufreni. He dedicated his *Menechmes* to Deſpreaux, and afterwards writ againſt him, becauſe he had not done him juſtice. Notwithſtanding the gaiety of his temper, he died of chagrin at the age of 52. It hath even been ſaid, that he cut ſhort the thread of his days himſelf. He made his exit in 1658.

Regnier Deſmarets (Seraphin) born at Paris in 1632: he improved our language much, and writ ſome pieces of poetry in French and Italian. He made one of his Italian pieces paſs for a work of Petrarch's, but could not have made his French verſes paſs for thoſe of a great poet. He took his leave of the world in 1713.

Renaudot (Theophraſtus) a phyſician, and very learned in more reſpects than one. He was the firſt writer of Gazettes in France, and died in 1679.

Renaudot (Euſebius) born in 1646: very learned in the oriental languages and in hiſtory. But he deſerves to be blamed for not allowing Bayle's dictionary to be printed in France. He died in 1720.

Richelet (Cœſar Peter) the firſt who compoſed a dictionary almoſt entirely of ſatire, in which he ſet an example more dangerous than uſeful.

Du Rier (Andrew) a gentleman in ordinary of the king's chamber. He was a long time at Conſtantinople, and in Egypt, in a public employment. We have a tranſlation by him of the Alcoran, and the hiſtory of Perſia.

Du Rier (Peter) born at Paris in 1605: he was ſecretary to the king, and hiſtoriographer of France, but poor notwithſtanding. He was the author of nineteen plays and thirteen tranſlations, all which were well received by his cotemporaries. He died in 1658.

La Rochefoucault (Francis, duke de) born in 1913: his memoirs are read, but his thoughts are not only read, but got by heart. He died in 1680.

Rohault (James) born at Amiens in 1620: he abridged and explained in a clear and methodical manner Deſcartes's philoſophical works. But all that can be ſaid for that great man's philoſophy at preſent is, that it exploded ancient errors, and ſubſtituted others in their places. He died in 1675.

Rollin (Charles) born at Paris in 1661, rector of the univerſity, and the firſt of that body who writ French with purity and dignity. The laſt volumes of his Ancient Hiſtory are not equal to the firſt, as being compoſed in much greater haſte; yet it is one of the beſt compilations extant in any language, becauſe Rollin was a maſter of eloquence, which few compilers are. Had he been alſo a philoſopher, it would have greatly enhanced the value of his work. There are a number of ancient hiſtories; but in none of them do we find that philoſophical ſagacity that diſtinguiſhes between truth and falſhood, between probability and fable, or fiction, and ſuppreſſes what is uſeleſs and frivolous. He died in 1741.

Rotrou (John) born in 1609: the founder of the theatre. The firſt ſcene and a part of the fourth act of Venceſlas are maſter-pieces. Corneille uſed to call him his father; but every one will agree that the ſon greatly ſurpaſſed the father. Venceſlas was not written till after the Cid. He died in 1650.

Rouſſeau (John Baptiſt) born at Paris in 1669. Fine verſes, great errors in conduct, and great

great ſufferings, have conſpired to render him famous. We muſt either ſuppoſe him the author of the verſes that occaſioned his baniſhment, which, by the bye, are not unlike many that he avowed, or throw a ſlur upon the two tribunals that condemned him. It is not indeed the firſt time that two tribunals, and even more numerous bodies, have, with one voice, pronounced very unjuſt ſentences, when party-ſpirit runs high. Thus much is certain, that the party againſt Rouſſeau were full of rancour and reſentment. Few men have ever been more univerſally hated and perſecuted. Nothing leſs would ſatisfy the public than his baniſhment; nay, their averſion continued unabated ſeveral years after. But at laſt the ſucceſs of his rival la Motte, the reception he met with, the reputation which, as they thought, he had unjuſtly and unfairly acquired, and the artifice by which he had raiſed himſelf to a ſort of empire in literature, made all the men of letters forſake him, and declare for Rouſſeau, whom they now no longer dreaded. By their means the public in general was reconciled to him. La Motte now began to appear to them too happy, becauſe he was rich and in vogue, not conſidering that he was blind, and laboured under many infirmities and diſorders. On the contrary, Rouſſeau was viewed in the light of an unhappy exile; and to live at Vienna or Bruſſels was thought a greater misfortune than to be blind and infirm. But indeed both were very unhappy: only the one was the victim of nature, the other of the unlucky adventure that occaſioned his baniſhment. Both may ſerve to ſhew what partiality and injuſtice men are capable of, how much they vary

in

in their judgments, and what folly it is to hunt after popular applauſe. He died at Bruſſels in 1740. See the article *La Motte*.

De La Rue (Charles) born in 1643, a Jeſuit, Latin and French poet, and preacher; he was one of thoſe that writ notes upon the claſſics, for the uſe of the dauphin. Virgil was the author that fell to his lot. He died in 1725.

Ruinard (Thierri) a Benedictine: he was a laborious critic: He maintained, in oppoſition to Dodwell, that there was an infinite number of martyrs in the primitive church. Perhaps he did not carefully enough diſtinguiſh between martyrdom and natural death, between perſecutions on a religious and a civil account. However that be, he muſt be ranked among the learned men of the age, in which the Benedictines have greatly diſtinguiſhed themſelves by the moſt profound reaſoning, as Martene, for inſtance, upon the ancient rites of the church. Tuilier and others have entirely diſpelled that cloud that long hung over the hiſtory and antiquities of the dark ages, eſpecially with regard to the church. This was a ſpecies of ſtudy that was unknown till the Age of Lewis XIV. and in France only were the Benedictines celebrated for it. He died in 1707.

De la Sabliere (Anthony de Rambouillet). His Madrigals are wrote with an elegant ſimplicity. He died in 1680.

Sacy le Maitre (Lewis Iſaac) born in 1613. One of the good writers of Port-Royal. The Royaumont Bible is by him, and a tranſlation of Terence's comedies: he died in 1684. His brother, Anthony le Maitre, retired alſo to

Port-Royal: he had been a counſellor at law, and was accounted very eloquent; but the opinion of the public changed upon reading his pleadings, which he had the vanity to publiſh. Another gentleman of the long robe, named Sacy, but not of the ſame family, and a member of the French academy, publiſhed a tranſlation of Pliny's Letters in 1701, that were well received by the public.

Le Sage, born in 1667: his romance of Gil Blas ſtill keeps its ground, becauſe it is natural: he died in 1747.

Saint Aulaire, (Francis Joſeph de Beau-poil, marquis de). It is ſomething very remarkable, that the fineſt of his verſes were compoſed when he was turned of ninety. Like the marquis de la Fare, he did not begin to exerciſe his talent for poetry, till he was paſt ſixty. Among the firſt verſes he publiſhed were the following, which were aſcribed to la Fare.

O muſe le légére & facile,
Qui ſur le coteau d' Helicon
Vintes offrir au vieil Anacréon
Cet art charmant, cet art utile,
Qui ſait rendre douce & tranquile
La plus incommode ſaiſon;
Vous qui de tant de fleurs ſur le Parnaſſe écloſes
Orniez à ſes côtés les graces & les ris,
Et qui cachiez ſes cheveux gris
Sous tant de couronnes de roſes, &c.

O muſe! indulgent and heart-eaſing,
Who on the hill of Helicon,
Conferr'd on old Anacreon,
That art ſo uſeful and ſo pleaſing,

That,

That, ev'n in winter's hoary reign,
With pleaſure beautifies the ſcene.
You, who with flow'rs on fair Parnaſſus growing,
Adorn'd the graces in his train,
And hid his locks of ſilver grain,
With wreaths of roſes ever blowing.

It was this performance that procured him a ſeat in the academy, tho' Boileau alledged it as the reaſon why he could not agree to his being admitted: he died in 1742, near an hundred years old, ſome ſay an hundred and two. Once being at ſupper with the dutcheſs of Maine, when he was above eighty years old, ſhe called him Apollo, and deſired to know ſome ſecret or other: his anſwer was,

La divinité qui s' amuſe
A me demander mon ſécret,
Si j' étais Apollo, ne ſerait point ma muſe:
Elle ſerait Thetis, & le jour finirait.

The goddeſs who my youth renews,
And would my ſecret comprehend,
Were I Apollo, ſhould not be my muſe;
She ſhould be Thetis, and the day ſhould end.

Anacreon, though younger, did not write ſuch pretty things. If the Greeks had had ſuch writers as our good ones, their vanity would have been ſtill greater than it was, and we ſhould have had more reaſon to admire them than we have.

Sainte Marthe. This family, for the ſpace of an hundred years and upwards, hath been fruitful

ful in good writers. The firſt Charles Gaucher de Sainte Marthe was an eloquent man for his time: he died in 1555.

Scevola, nephew of Charles, diſtinguiſhed himſelf both by his learning and his exploits. It was he that reduced Poitiers to the obedience of Henry IV. he died at Loudun in 1623, and the famous Urban Grandier pronounced his funeral oration.

Abel de Sainte Marthe, his ſon, was alſo a lover of learning, and died in 1652; and his ſon, who was likewiſe named Abel, trod in the ſteps of his father and grandfather, and died in 1706.

Scevola and *Lewis de Sainte Marthe*, twin-brothers, and ſons of Scevola. They were both eminent for their learning; and were buried in the ſame tomb at Paris, at St. Severin's. They compoſed together the *Gallia Chriſtiana*.

Denys de St. Marthe, their brother, concluded that work, and died at Paris in 1725.

Peter Scevola de Sainte Marthe, the eldeſt brother of the laſt Scevola, was hiſtoriographer of France, and died in 1690.

St. Evremont (Charles) born in Normandy in 1613. Looſe morals, letters writ to courtiers, at a time when the word *court* was pronounced with an emphaſis every where, indifferent verſes compoſed in illuſtrious ſocieties, and for that reaſon called Society Verſes, all theſe concurred, with a good deal of ſpirit, to raiſe the reputation of his works. They were printed by one des Maizeux, together with the life of the author, which alone makes one large volume, and yet in the whole there are not four pages that are intereſting. It contains ſcarce any thing but what is to be found in his works. It

was an impoſition of the booksellers and editors. By ſuch artifices a way hath been found to multiply books *in infinitum*, and without adding any thing to the knowledge of mankind. His exile, his philoſophy, and works, are well known. When he was aſked on his death-bed, if he would be reconciled to the church? his anſwer was, "I wiſh I could be reconciled to my appetite." He died in 1703, and was interred at Weſtminſter, with the kings and illuſtrious men of England.

Saint Pavin (Denys Languin de). He was one of thoſe good authors whom Deſpreaux, in his Satires, confounded with the bad. What little he writes is eſteemed for its elegance and delicacy. As for his perſonal merit, we may judge of it by the epitaph which Fieubet, maſter of requeſts, and one of the politeſt gentlemen of the age, made for him.

Sous ce tombeau gît Saint-Pavin;
Donne des larmes à ſa fin.
Tu fus de ſes amis peut-être?
Pleure ton ſort & le ſien:
Tu n'en fus pas? pleur le tien,
Paſſant, d'avoir manqué d'en être.

Here St. Pavin in mould'ring duſt is laid,
O'er his cold grave a tear in pity ſhed.
Among his friends, perhaps, thy name was told:
If ſo, his fate and thine bemoan:
But if it was not, weep thy own,
That in the happy band thou never waſt enroll'd.

Le

L'Abbé de Saint Pierre (Caſtel), a gentleman of Normandy, who, tho' his income was not great, yet, for ſome time, ſhared it with the celebrated Fontenelle and Varignon: he writ a great deal on politics. There is no better character of his works in general, than that given by the cardinal de Bois, *viz.* that they were the reveries of a good ſubject: he was ſimple enough to inculcate often in his works the moſt trivial moral truths, and to propoſe for the moſt part things impracticable: he was continually harping on the ſcheme of a perpetual peace, and a ſort of univerſal parliament, which he called the diet of Europe. Part of this chimerical project had been attributed to Henry IV. and the abbé de St. Pierre, the better to recommend his notions, pretended that the European diet had been planned and approved of, by the dauphin duke of Burgundy, and that the ſcheme was found among his papers after his death. But it was a meer fiction of his own, to make his project be the better reliſhed. He honeſtly publiſhed the anſwer that cardinal Fleury made to his propoſal: "You have forgot, monſieur, ſays the cardinal, to propoſe in the firſt place to ſend a company of miſſionaries to prepare and diſpoſe the hearts of the ſeveral princes." Yet, notwithſtanding all this, the abbé de St. Pierre did a deal of good. He contributed not a little to deliver France from the hardſhips of the arbitrary land-tax; with reſpect to that, and that alone, he writ and acted like a ſtateſman. He was unanimouſly excluded the French academy, becauſe he had, during the regency of the duke of Orleans, a little too harſhly oppoſed in his Polyſynodie the eſtabliſhment of councils to the method of

of governing adopted by Lewis XIV. the protector of the academy. The intrigue for that end was managed by the cardinal de Polignac, and ſucceeded. What is a little unaccountable, is, that the regent did not prevent it, though the cardinal de Polignac was at that very time plotting againſt him; and he had given the abbé St. Pierre an apartment in the Palais Royal, and had his whole family in his ſervice. However, the abbé did not complain. He continued to live like a philoſopher, with thoſe very perſons who had excluded him. Boyer, the ancient biſhop of Mirepoix, his fellow-member, prevented his elogium from being pronounced at the academy according to cuſtom. Theſe fine ſpeeches at the death of an accademician add nothing either to his merit or reputation; yet in the preſent caſe, the refuſal was barbarous: the ſervice he had done his country, his probity, and his gentle diſpoſition, entitled him to another ſort of treatment. A few days before his death, I aſked him what he thought of it: He replied, that he conſidered it as a journey or jaunt into the country. Of all his performances, that on the future abolition of Mahomedaniſm is the moſt remarkable. He is poſitive that the time will come, when reaſon will be an overmatch for ſuperſtition every where; that men will ſee and be convinced, that, to pleaſe God, patience, beneficence, and humanity alone are requeſted.

It is impoſſible, ſays he, that a book, in which falſehoods are aſſerted for truths, abſurdities advanced that contradict common ſenſe, and praiſes beſtowed on actions manifeſtly unjuſt,

ſhould be a revelation from God. He fancies that in 500 years time, all ſorts of perſons, even the loweſt, will be convinced of the impoſture, and that even the mufti and the cadis will find it their intereſt to diſabuſe the people, and to reform their religion, in order to render themſelves more neceſſary and reſpected. 'Tis a curious piece.

Sallo (Denis) born in 1626. A counſellor of the parliament of Paris. He was the firſt that introduced journals, which Bayle perfected. They have ſince been brought into diſgrace by greedy bookſellers, and obſcure writers, who have filled them with falſe extracts, lies, and impertinence. In ſhort, applauſe and abuſe is become a traffic, eſpecially in periodical papers, by which ſcandalous doings, learning hath been much diſparaged. He died in 1669.

Sandraſs de Courtils, born at Montargis in 1644. I have mentioned him for no other reaſon, but to put the French, eſpecially foreigners, on their guard againſt thoſe forgeries publiſhed in Holland. Courtils was one of the moſt infamous writers in this reſpect. He deluged Europe with fictions, under the title of hiſtories. What a ſcandalous thing was it, that a captain of the regiment of Champagne ſhould go to Holland, and ſupport himſelf by ſelling lies to the bookſellers. He, and ſuch as follow his example, in writing libels againſt their country, againſt good princes who ſcorn, and private perſons who have it not in their power to puniſh them, can be conſidered only as the moſt execrable and abandoned wretches. He wrote the Conduct of France ſince the peace of Nimeguen,

and

and the anſwer to it. The State of France under Lewis XIII. and XIV. The Conduct of Mars in the Dutch wars. The Love Conqueſts of the great Alcander. The Love Intrigues of France. The Life of Turenne and Admiral Coligni. The Memoirs of Rochefort, Artagnan, Monbrun, Vordac, of the marchioneſs de Frene. The political Teſtament of Colbert, and many other pieces, by which ſimpletons have been impoſed upon and abuſed. The authors of thoſe miſerable pamphlets againſt France, intituled le Glaneur, l'Epilogueur, are his humble imitators. Theſe pieces, which hunger prompted, and ſtupidity and falſehood dictated, are read by none but the canaille. He died at Paris in 1712.

Santeuil (Lewis) A canon regular, and the author of ſome pretty verſes. The age of Lewis XIV. produced a vaſt number of indifferent poets, in whom, however, we ſometimes meet with beautiful lines. But theſe are to be attributed to the times, not to the genius of the authors. He died in 1714.

Sanſon (Nicholas) born at Abbeville in 1600. He was the firſt good writer on geography before William de L'Iſle, and died in 1667. His ſons were alſo eminent in that way.

Santeuil (Jean Bapt.) born at Paris in 1600. He was an excellent Latin poet, if that is poſſible, but could not make French verſes. His hymns are ſtill ſung in England. He died in 1697.

Sarraſin (John Francis) born near Caen in 1605. He is an agreeable writer both in proſe and verſe. He died in 1655.

Savari (James) born in 1622. He was the firſt that wrote on commerce, having been a long time a merchant. The council conſulted him with regard to the ordinance of 1670, and he drew up almoſt all the articles of it. The dictionary of commerce, writ by him and his brother Philemon canon of St. Maur, was an undertaking as uſeful as new. But books of that ſort are like the intereſts of princes, that change every fifty years and leſs. At preſent, the objects, the channels, the returns, and the arts of trade are very different from what they were in the days of Savari. He died in.

Saumaiſe (Claud) born in Burgundy in 1588. He retired to Leyden to enjoy the liberty of the country. His erudition is well known. He died in 1653.

Saurin (James) born at Niſmis in 1677. He was eſteemed the beſt preacher among the proteſtants. Notwithſtanding, his ſtyle is ſaid to ſavour of the refugee. It can hardly be ſuppoſed, ſays he, that thoſe who have forgone their country for the ſake of their religion, ſhould ſpeak their native language in its purity. But in his time, the French ſpoken in Holland was better than it is at preſent. Bayle's ſtyle had nothing of the refugee; the only thing that can be objected to it, is a familiarity that approaches ſometimes to lowneſs. The defects in the language of the Calviniſt preachers, were occaſioned chiefly by their copying the incorrect phraſeology of the firſt reformers; beſides, almoſt all of them having been educated at Saumur, in Poitou, in Dauphine, and Languedoc, they ſtill retained the vitious provincial modes

of

of expreſſion. The place of miniſter to the nobility at the Hague was inſtituted on purpoſe for Saurin. He was a man of learning and pleaſure, and died in 1730. His family was not all related to that of Joſeph Saurin of the academy of ſciences, who is the author of ſome extracts from the Journal des Scavants, ſome mathematical memoirs, and the noted Factum againſt Rouſſeau. Joſeph died in 1737.

Sauveur (Joſeph) born at la Fleche in 1653. He learned the elements of geometry without the help of any maſter, and is among the firſt that calculated the chances in games of hazard. He uſed to ſay, that one man could do as much as another in mathematics. This will hold true with regard to mere learners; but not to them who apply themſelves to make diſcoveries. He was dumb till the age of ſeventeen, and died in 1716.

Scarron (Paul) the ſon of a counſellor of the great chamber, was born in 1598. His comedies are rather farces than comedies, and Virgil Traveſte could be received only as the work of a buffoon. His Comical Romance is the only piece of his that is ſtill reliſhed by people of taſte, as Boileau predicted. He died in 1660.

Scuderi (George de) born at Havre de Grace in 1603. Patroniſed by cardinal de Richlieu, he rivalled, for ſome time, Corneille in fame. His name is better known than his works. He died in 1667.

Scuderi (Magdalen) George's ſiſter, born at Havre in 1607. She is better known at preſent by ſome pretty pieces of poetry, than by the unwieldy romances of Clelie and Cyrus. Lewis

XIV. treated her with reſpect, and ſettled a penſion upon her. She gained the firſt prize for eloquence beſtowed by the academy. Her death happend in 1701.

Segrais (John) born at Caen in 1625. Mademoiſelle calls him a ſort of bel eſprit, but he was indeed a very great wit, and a man of letters into the bargain. He was obliged to quit that Princeſs's ſervice, for oppoſing her marriage with the count de Lauſun. His Eclogues, and tranſlation of Virgil, were then admired, but are little regarded at preſent. What is remarkable, is, that ſome of the verſes of Brebeuf's Pharſalia are ſtill quoted, but not one of Segrais's Virgil. Notwithſtanding, Boileau crys up Segrais, but runs down Brebeuf. He died in 1701.

Senaut (John Francis) born in 1601. General of the oratory, and a preacher, who was, with regard to F. Bourdaloue, what Rotrou was to Corneille, his predeceſſor, and ſometimes, tho' rarely, his equal. He is to be reckoned rather among the reſtorers of eloquence, than among the truly eloquent, who have been very few.

Senecai, firſt valet de chambre to Maria Thereſa. He was a poet of a ſingular turn of imagination. His tale of Kaimae, take it altogether, diſcovers a very great genius. It ſerves to ſhew, that very pretty tales may be told in a manner quite different from that of Fontaine. 'Tis obſervable that this piece, tho' the beſt he writ, is the only one not to be found in his collection. His Travaux d'Apollon has alſo peculiar beauties.

Sevigné

Sevigné (Mary de Rabutin) born in 1626. Her letters, which are full of anecdotes, and writ with freedom and ſpirit, in a lively ſtyle, are the beſt criticiſm that can be on your ſtudied letters, in which there is a manifeſt affectation of wit, and ſtill more on theſe fictitious letters writ to imaginary correſpondents, and ſtuffed with abſurd ſentiments and adventures in a pretended epiſtolary ſtyle. She died in 1696.

Sylva, a Jew of Bourdeaux. He was a celebrated Phyſician at Paris, and writ a book on blood-letting. But he was a much greater man than one would ſuppoſe from his book; and ſuch a phyſician as Moliere neither could nor durſt attempt to ridicule. He died about the year 1746.

Simon (Richard) born in 1638. He was of the oratory, and an excellent critic. His hiſtory of the origin and progreſs of eccleſiaſtical revenues, and critical hiſtory of the old teſtament, &c. are read by the learned every where. He died at Dieppe in 1712.

Sirmond (James) a jeſuit, born about the year 1559. He was one of the moſt learned and amiable men of his time, but little known as confeſſor to Lewis XIII. by reaſon of his peaceable deportment in that ſlippery office. The pope made choice of him, preferably to all the learned men of Italy, to write the preface to the hiſtory of the councils. His numerous works were held in great eſteem in his own time, but are very little read now. He died in 1651.

Sirmond (John) nephew of the former, hiſtoriographer

riographer of France, and privy-counſellor; an honour commonly annexed to the office of hiſtoriographer. One of his principal works is the life of cardinal d'Amboiſe; which he writ with no other view, but to make him appear inferior to cardinal de Richlieu, his patron. He was one of the firſt academicians, and died in 1649.

Sorbieres (Samuel) born in Dauphiny in 1610. One of thoſe that have had the title of hiſtoriographer of France. Having been intimate with pope Clement IX. before his exaltation, and not receiving from him any thing but trifles, he writ to him thus: "Your holineſs "ſends me ruffles, before I have got a ſhirt." He writ but ſuperficially upon ſeveral ſciences; and died in 1670.

De la Suze (Henrietta de Coligni, counteſs) famous in her day for her wit and her elegies. She turned papiſt becauſe her huſband was a hugenot, and parted from him, in order, as queen Chriſtina uſed to ſay, that ſhe might not ſee him either in this world or the next. She died in 1673.

Tallemant (Francis) born at Rochelle in 1620. The ſecond tranſlator of Plutarch. He died in 1690.

Tallemant (Paul) born at Paris in 1642. Although his grand-father was the rich Montoron and his father maſter of requeſts, with an income of 200,000 livres preſent money, yet he had little or nothing; but Colbert provided for him, as he did for many other learned men. He had a principal hand in the medallic hiſtory of the king. He died in 1712.

Talon

Talon (Omer) attorney-general of the parliament of Paris, hath left ſome valuable memoirs, worthy of a good magiſtrate and citizen. He died in 1652.

Tarteron, a jeſuit. He tranſlated the ſatires of Horace, Perſeus, and Juvenal, ſuppreſſing thoſe groſsly obſcene paſſages, with which one is ſurpriſed to find the works of Juvenal, but eſpecially Horace, ſullied. In doing this he had an eye to the youth, for whoſe benefit his labours were intended; but his tranſlation is not literal enough for them; he has given the ſenſe, but not the import of the particular words.

Terraſſon (L'Abbe) born in 1669. He both lived and died like a philoſopher. There are many good things in his Setos. He has tranſlated Diodorus well, but his examen of Homer diſcovers no ſort of taſte. He died 1750.

Thiers (John Baptiſt) born at Chartres in 1641. He is author of a number of diſſertations. It was he who attacked in print the inſcription on the convent of the Cordeliers at Rheims, which runs thus. To God and St. Francis, who were both crucified. He died in 1703.

Thomaſin (Lewis) of the oratory born in provence in 1619. He was a man profoundly learned, and the firſt that collated manuſcripts of the fathers, councils, and hiſtory. Towards the end of his life, he loſt his memory entirely, ſo that he forgot that he had ever writ any. He died in 1695.

Thoynard (Nicholas) born at *Orleans* in 1629. He is ſuppoſed to have had a great hand in cardinal Norris's tract on the Syrian epochs. His harmony of the goſpels in Greek is eſteemed a

curious piece. He was a mere ſcholar, but a very profound one. He died in 1708.

De Torci (John Baptiſt Colbert) nephew of the great Colbert, Miniſter of ſtate under Lewis XIV. He left memoirs of the public tranſactions from the peace of Riſwick to that of Utrecht. They were publiſhed, while this eſſay on the age of Lewis was in the preſs, and confirms every thing advanced in it. They are very minute, and therefore only fit for thoſe that want to be thoroughly acquainted with the ſubject of them. The ſtyle is better than that of any of the memoir writers his predeceſſors. It diſcovers the taſte of Lewis XIV.'s court. But what ſtamps the higheſt value on them is, the candour and ſincerity of the author, which ſhines through the whole. He died in 1746.

Toureil (James) born at Thouloufe in 1656. His tranſlation of Demoſthenes is well known. He died in 1715.

Tournefort (Joſeph Pitton de) born in Provence in 1656. He was the greateſt botaniſt in his time. He travelled by order of Lewis XIV. into Spain, England, Holland, Greece, and Aſia, for the improvement of natural hiſtory. He added to the catalogue of plants 1336 new ones, and taught us to know our own. He died in 1708.

Le Tourneux, born in 1640. His Chriſtian year is much read, tho' it is in the index expurgatorius of Rome, or rather perhaps becauſe it is there. He died 1686.

Triſtan l'hermite, gentleman to Gaſton of Orleans, brother to Lewis XIII. The long and ſurpriſing run which his tragedy of Mari-

amne

name had, was owing to the ignorance of the times. They had then no better; and it even held up its head some time after Corneille made his appearance. In some nations, at this day, very indifferent performances pass for master-pieces, because they have had none better. It is not generally known that *Tristan* turned the office of the virgin into verse, nor is it at all strange that it is not. He died in 1655.

Here follows his epitaph.

Je fis le chien couchant auprès d'un grand Seigneur.
Je me vis toujours pauvre, & tâchai de paraître.
Je vécus dans la peine attendant le bonheur,
Et mourus sur un coffre en attendant mon Maître.

A wretched spaniel crouching by his lord,
I still was poor, and pleaded still disaster;
I liv'd in waiting at proud fortune's board;
And dy'd upon a bench, in waiting on my master.

Vaillant (John Foy) born at Beauvais in 1632. The public is indebted to him for the Science des Medailles, and the king for one half of his cabinet. Colbert the minister sent him to Italy, Greece, Egypt, Turky, and Persia. In 1674, he, and the architect Desgodet, were taken by the Algerines, and both ransomed by the king. Never did any learned man encounter so many dangers. He died in 1706.

Vaillant (John Francis) born at Rome in 1665, when his father visited that city. He was an antiquary, as his father had been, and died in 1708.

Valincourt (John Baptist Henry du Trousel

de) born in 1653. He is chiefly known by an epiſtle which Diſpreaux addreſſes to him, tho' he writ ſome little things himſelf. He acquired a handſome fortune, which is more than he would have done, had he minded nothing but his books. Mere ſcholarſhip, without that activity and ſagacity which renders a man uſeful, leads to nothing but miſery and contempt. One of the beſt diſcourſes ever ſpoken at the academy, is that wherein Mr. de Valincourt endeavours to correct the error of that multitude of young people, who, miſtaking an itch of writing for genius and talent, peſter princes with their verſes, deluge the public with pamphlets, accuſing them of ingratitude, becauſe they forſooth are fools and idlers. He begs that thoſe of them that have an ear would hear, and be perſuaded, that the profeſſion which they look upon as the loweſt, is infinitely more eligible than that which they have taken up. He died in 1730.

Valois (Adrian) born at Paris in 1607, hiſtoriographer of France. His beſt works are his notice des Gaules, and his hiſtory of the firſt race of our kings. He died in 1692.

Valois (Henry) brother of the foregoing, born in 1603. His works are leſs intereſting to the French than thoſe of his brother. He died in 1676.

Varignon (Peter) born at Caen in 1654. A celebrated mathematician. He died in 1722.

Varillas (Anthony) born in la Marche in 1624. An hiſtorian more agreeable than exact. He died in 1696.

Le Vaſſor (Michael) of the oratory and a refugee in England. His hiſtory of Lewis XIII. tho'

the' diffusive, heavy, and sarcastic, is in respect for many singular transactions to be found in it: but he is an odious declaimer, who, under pretence of writing the history of Lewis XIII. aims at nothing but the depreciating Lewis XIV. sparing neither the living nor the dead. With regard to facts he is generally in the right; but that is not supposed to be the case with regard to his characters and reflections. He died in 1681.

Varesseur, born in Charalois in 1605. A jesuit, and very learned. He was the first who made it appear, that the Greeks and Romans were absolute strangers to burlesque, and that it is a relic of barbarism. He died in 1681.

Vauban (marshal) born in 1633. His project of the tenth penny could not be carried into execution, and is, in fact, impracticable. He left behind him several memoirs, worthy of so good a subject, and died in 1707.

Vaugelas (Claude Favre de), born at Chambery in 1585. He is one of those that first contributed to the regulating and refining of our language, and who could write verses in Italian, but not in French. During thirty years he was retouching and altering his translation of Quintus Curtius. Every author ought to make his works as perfect as possible, and for that end to be correcting them all his life. He died in 1650.

Le Vayer (Francis), born at Paris in 1588. He was preceptor to Monsieur brother to Lewis XIV. and, during one year, to Lewis himself. He was also historiographer of France, and counsellor of state. His scepticism was well

known

known, and yet did not prevent his being entrusted with the important office of educating theſe princes. Though his works are too proliix, yet there is a great deal of juſt reaſoning and learning in them. He was certainly the moſt learned member of the academy. His ſcepticiſm is bolder and more undiſguiſed than that of Bayle, and he is more ſevere and cynical in his ſatire. His motto was,

De las coſas mas ſeguras
La mas ſegura es dudar.

Of all thoſe maxims deem'd ſecure,
The moſt ſecure is ſtill to doubt.

As that of Montagne, *Que ſçai je?* i. e. What know I? He died in 1672.

Veiſſiures (Mathurin de la Croze), born at Nantes in 1661. A Benedictine at Paris. Being a free-thinker, and his ſuperior of a quite different character, he took the reſolution to quit both his order and his religion. He was a prodigy both for learning and memory. Not content with ſtudying and underſtanding what was uſeful and agreeable, he muſt needs ſtudy what could not be known, ſuch as the ancient Egyptian language. One piece that he writ upon the chriſtianity of the Indies, is much eſteemed. There is one thing remarkable that we learn from it, and that is, that the brahmins, notwithſtanding the idolatry of the people, believe that there is but one God. Such is the itch of writing, that a life of this man hath been publiſhed, making a volume as large as that of Alexander.

Alexander. Such an extract as this would have been enough, and too much. He died at Berlin in 1739.

Hayem (James), born at Paris in 1675. He is, with regard to Fontaine, the same that Campistron is to Racine, an imitator, feeble, but natural. He was assassinated at Paris by two highwaymen in 1720. It is insinuated in Moreri, that the cause of his death was a parody he writ against a powerful prince; but that is false.

Vertot (René Aubert), born in Normandy in 1655. An elegant and agreeable historian. He died in 1735.

Vichart de St. Real (Cæsar), born at Chamberry, but educated in France. His history of the conspiracy of Venice is a masterpiece, but that is more than can be said of his life of Jesus Christ. He died in 1692.

Villars de Montfaucon (l'abbé de), born in 1635. He is well known as the author of the Count de Gabalis, built upon a part of the ancient mythology of the Persians. He was shot dead with a pistol in 1673; upon which it was said, that the sylphs had assassinated him for revealing their mysteries.

Villars (marshal duke de), born in 1652. He wrote the whole first tome of the memoirs that bear his name. He died in 1734.

Villedieu (madame de). Her romances have gained her a reputation. But I would not have the reader think that I set any value upon that inundation of romances with which France hath been lately overflowed. Almost all of them, except *Zaïd*, are the productions of persons

ſons of no genius, who writ in an eaſy agreeable ſtyle things unworthy the notice of men of ſenſe. Moſt of them are quite deſtitute of imagination, and though read and admired by young people, whoſe taſte they ſpoil, they are not worth, all together, four pages of Arioſto. She died in 1683.

Villiers (Peter), born at Coignac in 1648. A jeſuit. He was a man of letters, as almoſt all of that order are. His ſermons, and his poem on the art of preaching, were eſteemed in his own time. His verſes on ſolitude are far ſuperior to thoſe of St. Amant on the ſame ſubject, though ſo much admired, but are not, after all, worthy of the age of Lewis XIV. which ſo far outſhone that in which St. Amant lived. His death happened in 1728.

Voiture (Vincent), born at Amiens in 1598. He was the firſt Frenchman that was what is called in France a bel eſprit. His writings have little elſe to recommend them, and yet they are not proper models to form our taſte upon; but wit was then a rare thing. He writ ſome very pretty bits of poetry, but nothing conſiderable. That which he addreſſed to Anne of Auſtria is an evidence of the freedom and gallantry that reigned in that queen's court, notwithſtanding the ſevere trials her goodneſs and patience underwent from the Frondeurs: but theſe are not in the printed collection. He goes on thus,

Je penſais ſi le Cardinal,
J'entends celui de la Valette,

Pouvoit

Pouvait voir l'éclat ſans égal
Dans lequel maintenant vous êtes *,
J'entends celui de la beauté,
Car auprès je n'eſtime guere,
Cela ſoit dit ſans vous déplaire,
Tout l'éclat de la majeſté.

Should now the cardinal ſurvey,
(The cardinal Valette I mean)
Th' unequall'd ſplendor you diſplay,
In Chriſtendom the brighteſt queen.
In beauty firſt, for as to rank,
(Let not my words diſpleaſure draw)
And regal pomp, 'tis all a blank;
'Tis what I value not a ſtraw.

He was alſo a good verſifier in Spaniſh and Italian, and died in 1648.

It is not worth while to carry this catalogue any farther. The reader will find in it a few great geniuſes, and many imitators; and to the learned men I have mentioned, a conſiderable number might have been added. It can hardly be expected that any new or original geniuſes ſhould appear for the future, unleſs other manners, and another ſort of government, ſhould give a new turn to the human mind. It is impoſſible there ſhould be any ſuch thing as men univerſally learned, becauſe every ſcience is be-

* It was then the cuſtom to retrench final letters in verſe, when the rhime required it. As *vous été* for *vous êtes*. The Engliſh and Italians do ſo at preſent. French poeſy is too much limited, and often approaches too near to proſe.

come

come unlimited. The learned, therefore, muſt be content each to cultivate a corner of that vaſt field that was cleared and enclosed in the age of Lewis XIV.

CHAP. CCXV.

Of Celebrated Artists.

Musicians.

FRENCH muſic, eſpecially the vocal, is diſliked by all other nations. It cannot be otherwiſe, in regard that the French proſody or verſification differs from that of *every* other country of Europe. We make the pauſe always upon the laſt ſyllable, whereas all others make it upon the penult, or antepenult, as the Italians. Our language is the only one that hath words terminating in e mute, and thoſe e's that are not pronounced in ordinary diſcourſe, yet are uniformly ſo in muſic, as *gloiren, victoi-reu, barbari-eu, fuai-eu*, &c. Hence it comes, that moſt of our airs and recitative are inſupportable to thoſe who have not been accuſtomed to them. The climate denies us that flexibility of voice which it gives the Italians, and it is not cuſtom among us, as at Rome, and other Italian courts, to make eunuchs of men, in order to render their voices finer than thoſe of women. All theſe things, joined to the flow-

neſs

flats of our singing, which, by the bye, forms a strange contrast with our native vivacity, will always make the *French* music disagreeable to any but Frenchmen.

After all, foreigners, who have resided some considerable time in France, acknowledge that our musicians have performed wonders in adapting their airs to our words, and also that the music is very expressive; but only so to ears that have been some time accustomed to it, and besides the execution must be very good.

Our instrumental music is not altogether free from the monotony and slowness of the vocal; but many of our symphonies and tunes have been relished by foreigners. They are admitted into many of the Italian operas, and scarce any others are in use at the court of a king who has one of the best operas in Europe, and who, among his other extraordinary talents, has a fine taste for music, which he cultivates with great assiduity.

John Baptist Lully, who was born at Florence in 1633, and came to France at the age of fourteen, when he could perform on no instrument but the violin, was the parent of true French music. He knew how to suit his art to the genius of the language, which was the only sure way to succeed: but at that time the Italian music had not begun to deviate from that gravity and noble simplicity which we still admire in Lully's recitative. Nothing resembles these recitatives more than the *Motti* of *Lugi*, sung in Italy with so much success in the 17th century, which begins thus:

Sunt

Sunt breves mundi roſæ, ſunt fugitivi flores,
Frondes veluti annoſæ, ſunt labiles honores.

The roſe's date is brief;
The lillies ſoon decay;
And like the annual leaf,
Frail honours fleet away.

It muſt be obſerved, that in this pure recitative muſic, which is the Melopee of the ancients, the beauty of the ſinging is principally owing to the natural melody of the words; no words but ſuch as are muſical can well have a place in recitative. But of this they were not ſufficiently ſenſible in the days of Quinault and Lully. The poets were jealous of theſe gentlemen as poets, but not as muſicians. Boileau thus addreſſes Quinault:

Ces lieux communs de Morale lubrique
Que Lulli rechauffa des ſons de ſa Muſique.

Thoſe hackney'd thoughts, ſo wanton yet ſo tame,
That Lulli ſtrove to warm at muſick's flame.

The tender paſſions, which Quinault expreſſed ſo well, were much rather a ſtriking picture of the human heart, than a looſe morality; his diction animated the muſic ſtill more than Lully's art did the words. Theſe two, with the help of actors, have, of ſome ſcenes of Atis, Armida, and Roland, made an entertainment ſuch as no people, ancient or modern, can match.

match. Detached airs and ariettes did not at all come up to the perfection of these grand scenes. They very much resembled our Christmas carols, or the Venetian barcaroles; and yet they were contented with them at that time. The more artless the music then was, the fonder they were.

After Lully, all our musicians, such as Colasse, Campra, Destouches, and others, copied after him, till at last one appeared, who far excels them in sublime harmony; and hath vastly altered and improved the art of music.

With regard to sacred music, though we have had some celebrated composers in France, yet their pieces have not yet been executed any where but in the king's chapel.

Of PAINTERS.

The case is not the same with regard to painting as with music. The latter may be such as to please none but the natives, because the genius of the language is incompatible with any other; but painters ought to represent nature, which is the same every where, and seen with the same eyes.

The only true test of a painter's merit is the judgment of foreigners. It is not enough that he has a party, and is cried up by scribblers; his works must be in request, and bear a high price. What sometimes hampers the genius of painters one would be apt to imagine would elevate and enlarge it, I mean the particular taste or manner of the school, or of those who preside in it. Academies are, without doubt, extremely

extremely useful to form pupils, especially when the directors aim at the sublime in painting; but if they are men of a groveling taste, if their manner is dry and minute, if their figures are ungraceful, their pieces painted like fans; their pupils are the dupes of imagination, or aiming at the applause of a bad master. There is a sort of fatality attends academies. None of the works stiled academic, of any kind, have been works of genius. Suppose an artist extremely solicitous lest he should not hit the manner of his fellow academicians, his productions will infallibly be stiff and disgusting. But if a man is free from these prejudices, and aims only at the copying of nature, it is ten to one but he succeeds. Almost all the eminent painters either flourished before the establishment of academies, or got the better of the prejudices contracted there.

Corneille, Racine, Despreaux, and Le Mothe, took a rout quite different from their brethren, and in consequence had most of them for their enemies.

Nicholas Poussin, born at Andelis in Normandy in 1599. Nature gave him a genius for painting, which he improved at Rome. He is called the painter of men of sense; with equal justice may he be denominated that of men of taste. His only defect is, his heightening the dismal and solemn in the colouring of the Roman school. He was the greatest painter in Europe in his time. He was invited from Rome to Paris; but was fain to give way to envy and cabal, and to withdraw, as many other ingenious men have done. He went back

back to Rome, where he lived poor, but contented, his philoſophy enabling him to deſpiſe the frowns of fortune. He died in 1665.

Le Sueur, born at Paris in 1617. He had no other maſter than Vouet, and yet became a celebrated painter. He had carried the art to a high degree of perfection, when he was taken off the ſtage of time at the age of thirty-eight years, in 1655.

Bourdon and *Valentin* were eminent men. Three of the beſt pictures that adorn the church of St. Peter at Rome, are by Pouſſin, Bourdon, and Valentin.

Charles le Brun, born at Paris 1619. Scarce had he begun to diſplay his talent, when the ſuperintendant Fouquet, one of the moſt generous, and at the ſame time moſt unhappy men that ever lived, gave him a penſion of 24,000 livres preſent money. His picture of the family of Darius at Verſailles is little ſhort, in point of colouring, of that of Paul Veroneſe, which faces it; and in reſpect of deſign, compoſition, dignity, expreſſion, and obſervance of *coſtume*, ſurpaſſes it. His battles of Alexander, engraved, are ſtill more in requeſt than thoſe of Conſtantine by Raphael and Julio Romano. He died in 1690.

Peter Mignard, born at Troyes in Champagne in 1610. He rivalled *Le Brun* ſometime in reputation: but he is now conſidered as much below him. He died in 1695.

Claud Lorrain. His father, when he would have made a paſtry-cook of him, did not foreſee that he would one day be reckoned one of

the greateſt landſkip-painters that ever Europe had produced. He died at Rome in 1678.

Caſe. We have ſome pieces of his that begin to be highly valued. We don't do juſtice to ingenious men in France ſo ſoon as we ought. Their indifferent performances often prevent us from ſeeing the beauties of their maſter-pieces. On the contrary, the Italians extol what is great and excellent, without taking notice of what is indifferent. Every nation ſeeks to promote its own glory and renown, except the French. They value nothing but what is foreign.

Joſeph Paroſſel, born in 1648. A good painter, but inferior to his ſon. He died in 1704.

John Jouvenet, born at Rouen in 1644. He was Le Brun's pupil, and a good painter, but not to be compared to his maſter. He hath painted almoſt every thing yellow; for by ſome extraordinary conformation of his organs, they appeared to him of that colour. He died in 1717.

John Baptiſte Santerre. There are ſome admirable pictures of his, the colour of which is juſt and delicate. His picture of Adam and Eve is one of the fineſt in Europe: that of St. Thereſa, in the chapel of Verſailles, is a very noble piece, but rather luſcious for an altar-piece.

La Foſſe diſtinguiſhed himſelf much in the ſame way.

Bon Boulogne was an excellent painter, of which the high price, and great demand for his pieces, are an evidence.

Lewis

Lewis Boulogne. His works, though not without merit, yet are not ſo much admired as his brother's.

Raous. His pieces are not all of equal merit. In ſome of them he is nothing ſhort of Rembrandt.

Rigaut. Though he excelled chiefly in portraits, yet his piece of cardinal Bouillon opening the jubilee, is not at all inferior to any of Rubens.

De Troie. He painted in Rigaut's manner. There are ſome good hiſtory-pieces by his ſon.

Vateau. He excelled as much in the graceful as Teniers did in the groteſque. Some of his pupils have done him honour.

Le Moine. His piece of Hercules's apotheoſis, at Verſailles, is perhaps ſuperior to any thing I have yet mentioned. It was intended as a compliment to cardinal Hercules de Fleury, who, by the bye, had nothing in common with the fabulous Hercules. It would have been more a-propos to have repreſented the apotheoſis of Henry IV. in the ſaloon of a French king. Le Moine, being envied by his brethren, and thinking himſelf ill-requited by the cardinal, died of grief and deſpair.

Beſides theſe there have been ſome other painters, who excelled in ſtill life, or in painting animals, as Deſportes and Oudry; others in miniature, and others in portraits. At preſent we have ſome that diſtinguiſh themſelves in the grand and ſublime, and poſterity, in all appearance, will have them too.

Of SCULPTORS, ARCHITECTS, and ENGRAVERS.

Under Lewis XIV. ſculpture was carried to perfection, in which it ſtill continues under Lewis XV.

James Sarraſin, born in 1598. He executed ſome maſter-pieces at Rome for pope Clement VIII. and at Paris he was equally ſucceſsful. He died in 1695.

Peter Puget, born in 1662. An architect, ſculptor, and painter. He is celebrated chiefly for his Andromeda, and Milo of Crotona. He died in 1695.

Italy is indebted to *Le Gros* and *Theodon* for many of its embelliſhments.

Francis Girardon, born in 1627. Antiquity can boaſt of nothing ſuperior to his bath of Hercules, and his tomb of cardinal Richlieu. He died in 1715.

Coiſevaux and *Couſton* were eminent in their way, beſides others; yet we have three or four ſculptors at preſent that excel them.

Chauveau, *Nanteuil*, *Meulan*, *Audran*, *Hedeling*, *le Clerc*, *les Drevet*, *Poilly*, *Picart*, *Duchange*, tho' they have been out-done ſince, yet they were ingenious men, and their engravings ſupply the want of original pictures, &c. all over Europe.

There were alſo ſome goldſmiths, ſuch as *Balin* and *Germain*, who, on account of the beauty of their deſigns, and elegance of execution,

tion, deſerve to be ranked among the moſt celebrated artiſts.

It is more difficult for one born with a genius for architecture to make his talent appear, than for any other artiſt. Unleſs he is ſet to work by princes, he has no opportunity to diſplay his taſte and ſkill in any work of grandeur and magnificence. Thus have the talents of many an architect been entirely uſeleſs to them.

Francis Manſard was one of the beſt architects of Europe. The chateau, or palace of Maiſons, near St. Germain's, is a maſterpiece, becauſe he was at liberty to give full ſcope to his genius.

Jules Hardouin Manſard his nephew, was ſuperintendant of the buildings under Lewis XV. and made an immenſe fortune. The beautiful chapel of the invalids is a deſign of his. As to the palace of Verſailles, he could not diſplay his talents to advantage in it, by reaſon of the ſituation.

Foreigners object to the city of Paris, that it has only two fountains in a good taſte; the old one of John Gougeon, and the new of Boucherdon: and even theſe are badly ſituated. Neither has it any magnificent theatre beſides that of the Louvre, which is not uſed. The places for the public diverſions and repreſentations, have neither proportion, taſte, nor ornament; and their ſituation is as bad as their contrivance, notwithſtanding the example that has been ſet

us by ſome cities in the provinces, but which we have not yet thought fit to follow. France, however, can boaſt of magnificent buildings of another ſort, and of more importance, ſuch as ſtately hoſpitals, ſtorehouſes, ſtone-bridges, quays, dykes for checking the inundations of rivers, canals, ſluices, ports, and eſpecially the fortifications of the frontier towns, in which beauty is united with ſolidity.

The magnificent ſtructures erected upon the deſigns of Perrault, Levau, and Dorbay, are too well known to require a detail.

The art of gardening was in a manner invented and perfected by Le Notre, and La Quintinie; by the former in reſpect of beauty and ornament, and by the latter with regard to utility.

Engraving of precious ſtones, coining of medals, and caſting of types for printing, have kept pace with the other arts in point of improvement.

Clocks and watches, the makers of which may be conſidered as a ſort of practical naturaliſts, have likewiſe been carried to a very high degree of perfection.

The watering of ſtuffs, and the gold too with which they are embelliſhed and enriched, diſcovers ſuch rare ingenuity and taſte, that what is worn only from vanity and luxury, deſerves to be preſerved as a monument of induſtry.

The

The making of porcelain was ſet on foot at St. Cloud before it was attempted any where elſe in Europe.

In fine, the laſt age hath taught the preſent how to unite, and tranſmit as a ſacred depoſit to poſterity, the whole aſſemblage of the arts and ſciences, each of them carried to the utmoſt perfection poſſible; and to do ſo, is actually the object and aim of numbers of learned and ingenious men at this day. But ſuch is the brevity of human life, that the execution of part of the immenſe and immortal deſign muſt be left to poſterity.

End of the NINTH VOLUME.

[redacted]

[redacted]